Berkeley
LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Berkeley
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA · LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA · LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA · LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

https://archive.org/details/twotreatisesonch00hickrich

TWO TREATISES,

ON THE

CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD,

AND ON THE

DIGNITY OF THE EPISCOPAL ORDER:

WITH

A PREFATORY DISCOURSE

IN ANSWER TO

A BOOK ENTITLED, THE RIGHTS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, &c.,

AND AN APPENDIX.

BY GEORGE HICKES, D.D.

SOMETIME FELLOW OF LINCOLN COLLEGE, AND DEAN OF WORCESTER.

THE FOURTH EDITION.

VOL. I.

OXFORD:

JOHN HENRY PARKER.

MDCCCXLVII.

OXFORD:
PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.

BX 5175
H62
1847
V.1

VOLUME I.

CONTAINING

AN ACCOUNT OF ADDITIONS TO THE THIRD EDITION,

A LETTER TO THE AUTHOR OF THE RIGHTS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH ASSERTED,

AND

A PREFATORY DISCOURSE IN ANSWER TO THE RIGHTS.

M277203

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE first edition of this work was published in one volume 8vo. in 1707. The volume consisted of the Letter to the Author of the Rights, the Prefatory Discourse, the Two Treatises (on the Christian Priesthood, and on the Dignity of the Episcopal Order), and an Appendix containing the first three numbers of the present Appendix, (namely, the Communion Service of King Edward VI.'s first Book, that of the Scottish Prayer-Book of 1637, and the representation of a medal of King Henry VIII.) The Two Treatises, which were originally Letters, as they are often called by the Author[a], had been written in or soon after the year 1695. The circumstances which led to their composition will be found detailed at the opening of the Prefatory Discourse, pp. 59—63 of this volume, and in the notes. They were at first intended only for private perusal. The publication of Tindal's work, The Rights of the Christian Church asserted, in 1706, led Hickes to publish them, with the Discourse in answer to that work prefixed; see p. 67 of this volume. A second edition, with some slight alterations, also in one volume 8vo., came out in the same year, and was issued with a new title-page in 1709. The second edition, whether of 1707 or 1709, is rarely met with.

A third edition was published in 1711, in which the work was enlarged to two volumes, by considerable additions to the first Discourse, on the subject of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; additions throughout the second Discourse; and nearly the whole of the present Appendix, (namely, No. IV. to No.

[a] [He also calls them Discourses, and that name is generally used by the editor.]

IX. inclusive): an Account of these Additions was prefixed, which was designed as a reply to the Primary Charge of Dr. Trimnel, bishop of Norwich, published in 1709.

In 1715, the year in which Hickes died (Dec. 15), a Supplement was sent out, containing the Letter to the Author of the Rights, which had been omitted by mistake in the third edition; several passages to be inserted in different places of the work; another tract, (No. X. see p. 35 of this volume,) to be added to the Appendix, and two letters on the subject of the Christian Priesthood; with a title-page to be prefixed as a new title-page to the third edition, with which the Supplement was bound up. Copies of this Supplement are very rare. In the present edition these additions have been inserted in their proper places, enclosed within brackets, with notices of their being derived from the Supplement of 1715.

This edition has also the advantage of a few still later materials, prepared by Hickes with a view to a fourth edition. They are contained in his own copy of the third edition, in which it seems to have been his practice to make additions and corrections from time to time. Most of these he printed in the Supplement of 1715; which was afterwards bound up with this copy, and the additions continued to be made till the time of his death. The following account of this copy, with transcripts of the MS. notes, has been received through the kindness of George May Forbes, Esq., of Edinburgh.

"This copy of Bishop Hickes' Christian Priesthood was formerly in the possession of Bishop Walker, of Edinburgh, by whom it was given to Bishop Jolly, in whose hand there is on the title-page the following note: 'A copy of singular value and high estimation, given by the Rev. Mr. Walker to Alexander Jolly.' And on the previous page, 'This was the author's own copy, and hath some corrections and additions in his own hand or that of his amanuensis, which he

design'd to be observ'd in a fourth edition, as the title-page shews. Most of these additions are in the printed Supplement.' On the title-page 'the *third* edition' is altered into 'the *fourth* edition.' The corrections are all written in the same hand, but at different times, as appears by the varied colour of the ink. A copy of the Supplement has been bound up with it, and some corrections are on it. The printed Supplement sometimes varies from the MS. in being incorrectly printed. E. g. Supp. No. 11, p. 10, l. 16,[b] for Ecl. ii. read Ecl. iii.; l. 20, facere *vel* idem; *σφραγίων, σφαγίων.* All the corrections printed in the Supplement are marked on the margin of this copy."

We are thus brought down to the latest alterations made during the Author's lifetime. The additions derived from this source have been inserted in the present edition, within brackets, with notices of their being taken from the MS. additions in Hickes' copy.

It only remains to state what has been done in the present edition.

The text and notes of the third edition have been preserved entire, except in the case of antiquated spelling, of references, for which others to later editions have been substituted, or of obvious errata; and when the latter were at all important, the corrections have been noticed. All additions, whether derived from the Supplement and the Author's MS., or made by the editor, have been enclosed within brackets.

The unsystematic character of the composition of the Prefatory Discourse, (of which see pp. 48, 49, and 319,) induced the editor to adopt a division into sections, for which a provision had been made by the Author in the Table of Contents; in which such a division was virtually made by the different type in which the chief heads of the Discourse were printed. The words of the Author have been, as far as

[b] [See vol. ii. p. 59. note b.]

possible, adhered to in the heading of the sections, as well as his divisions, as will be seen from the Table of Contents; and, as the sections are only noted in the margin, the text has been preserved without alteration.

The Table of Contents prefixed to the Prefatory Discourse has been retained as in the third edition; that of the Account of Additions, &c. has been added by the editor.

The editor is also responsible for the headings to the pages, which he hopes will be found fairly to represent the meaning of the Author, whose words he has endeavoured, as far as possible, to retain.

Some apology may be requisite for the length of the notes in the present volume; they seemed called for by its controversial character, and by the circumstance that it assumed the reader to be familiar with persons, events, and books which are now almost forgotten. Besides this, passages from works only referred to by the Author, and not generally accessible, have been given in full or abridged, in accordance with his own suggestion; see p. 327.

The division into three volumes, adopted in the present edition, was also suggested by the Author's observation, (Letter to Author of Rights, p. 49,) that the Prefatory Discourse "should be considered rather as another book than a preface," and that "if he could have foreseen it would have been so long he would have made it a book by itself." Its main subject too is distinct from those of the Two Discourses. The Discourses themselves will most naturally form a second volume; and the Appendix, which again is distinct, a third. Thus the tracts of the first volume will tend to remove the common objections against the doctrines which are systematically treated and maintained in the second, and the third will consist chiefly of writings of other authors expanding and supporting them.

It ought to be added that the editor in whose hands the

work was originally placed, had proceeded as far as p. 141 of this volume in verifying the references and transcribing the originals of the quotations, when ill health obliged him to relinquish the work. He had also prepared other materials for the edition, which have been of great service in completing his undertaking.

I. B.

Queen's College, June 4, 1847.

THE references have been made to the following editions, except when otherwise specified:—

Ainsworth's Annotations on the five books of Moses, fol. London, 1639.
Alcuinus, B., Op., ed. Frobenius, fol. Ratisbon. 1777.
Ambrosius, S., Op., ed. Ben. fol. Par. 1686-90.
Aquinas, S. Thom., Summa Theol. fol. Duaci. 1614.
Aristoteles, Op., ed. Bekker. 4to. Berol. 1831.
Assemani Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiæ Universalis, 4to. Romæ, 1749-67.
Augustinus, S., Op., ed. Ben. fol. Par. 1679-1700.
Balsamon, Comment. in Canones, ap. Beveregii Pandect.
Barnabas, S., ap. Patres Apost., tom. i.
Baronius, Annales, fol. Lucæ, 1738-59.
Basilius, S., Op., ed. Ben. fol. Par. 1721-30.
Beda, Op., fol. Col. Agrip. 1612.
Bernardus, S., Op., ed. Ben. fol. Par. 1719.
Bellarminus, Opera, fol. Venet. 1721-28.
Beveregii Συνοδικὸν seu Pandectæ Canonum, fol. Oxon. 1672.
Biblia Sacra, Castalionis Vers. Basil. 1573.
——— Pagnini et Montani. fol. Antw. 1584.
——— Polyglotta. Walton. fol. Lond. 1657.
Bibliotheca Patrum, Gallandii, fol. Venet. 1765-81.
Biographia Britannica, fol. London, 1747—66.
Biographical Dictionary, 8vo. London, 1761—67.
Bona, Card. de Rebus Liturgicis, 2 tom. fol. Aug. Taur. 1747.
Brissonius, Barn. de Formulis, &c. 4to. Francof. 1592.
Brissonius de significatione Verborum, 4to. Francof. 1683.
Budæus, Commentaria Linguæ Græcæ, fol. Paris. 1548.
Bull's Works, 8vo. Oxford, 1827.
Burnet's History of his Own Times, fol. Lond. 1724-34.
Buxtorf, Lexicon Chald. Rabb. Talmudicum. fol. Basil. 1639.
Canones Apostolici, ap. Concilia, tom. i.
Chrysostomus, S., Op., ed. Ben. fol. Paris. 1718-38.
Clemens Alexandrinus, S., Op., Potter, fol. Oxon. 1715.
Clemens Romanus, S., ap. Patres Apost., tom. i.
Conciliorum Collectio, Labbe et Coissart, ed. Colet. fol. Venet. 1728.
Constantini Lexicon, Genev. 1592.
Constitutiones Apostolicæ, ap. Concilia, tom. i.
Corpus Juris Canonici, ed. Gibert. fol. Lugd. 1737.
Corpus Juris Civilis, ed. Gothofred. fol. Amst. 1663.
Critici Sacri, fol. Amst. 1698.
Cyprianus, S., Op., ed. Ben. fol. Paris, 1726.
Cyrillus Alexandr. S., Op., fol. Paris, 1638.
Cyrillus Hierosolym. S., Op., fol. Paris, 1720.
Damascenus, S. Joan., Op., Lequien, fol. Paris. 1712.
Damianus, Petrus, Op., ed. Caietan. fol. Par. 1743.
Dionysius Areopagita, S., (Pseudo) Op., ed. Corderius, Venet. 1755.
Ecclesiast. Hist. Scriptores, ed. Reading, fol. Cantab. 1720.

Ephrem Syrus, S., Op., fol. Romæ, 1732.
Epiphanius, S., Op., ed. Petav. fol. Colon. 1682.
Evagrius, ap. Eccles. Hist. Script.
Eusebius Cæsariensis (Pamphili) Hist. Eccles. ap. Hist. Eccles. Scriptores.
——— Demonstratio Evangelica, fol. Paris, 1628.
——— Comment. in Psalmos, ap. Montfaucon, Nov. Collect. Patrum, tom. i.
——— Comment. in Esaiam, ibid., tom. ii.
General Dictionary, fol. London, 1734-41.
Goar, Euchologium Græcorum, fol. Par. 1647.
Gregorius Magnus, S., Op., ed. Ben. fol. Par. 1705.
Gregorius Nazianzenus, S., Op., ed. Ben. fol. Par. tom. i. 1778. tom. ii. 1840.
Gregorius Nyssenus, S., Op., fol. Paris, 1638.
Grotius, Op. Theol., fol. Lond. 1679, et ap. Crit. Sacr.
Habertus, Liber Pontificalis Eccl. Græc. fol. Paris, 1643.
Hermas, S., ap. Patres Apostolicos.
Hesychii Lexicon, fol. Lugd. Bat. 1668.
Hieronymus, S., Op., ed. Vallarsius, fol. Veron. 1734-42.
Ignatius, S., ap. Patres Apostolicos.
Innocentius III., Op., ed. Baluz. Par. 1682. fol.
Josephus, Op., ed. Havercamp. fol. Amst. 1726.
Irenæus, S., Op., ed. Ben. Par. 1710.
Isidorus Hispalensis, S., Op., 4to. Romæ, 1797-1803.
Isidorus Pelusiota, S., Epist. fol. Par. 1638.
Julianus Imp., Op., fol. Lips. 1696.
Justinus Martyr, S., Op., fol. Par. 1742.
Leo Magnus, S., Op., ed. Ballerin. fol. Venet. 1753.
Leslie's Theological Works, fol. Lond. 1721.
Maimonides, de cultu divino, 4to. Paris. 1678.
Martene de Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus, 2 tom. fol. Antw. 1763.
Martinii Lexicon Latin. Philol. et Etymol. fol. Franc. 1655.
Mede's Works, fol. London, 1664.
Montfaucon, Nova Collectio Patrum, fol. Par. 1706.
Œcumenius, Op., fol. Par. 1630-1.
Optatus, S., de Schism. Donatist. ed. Dupin, fol. Par. 1700.
Origenes, Op., ed. Ben. Par. 1733-59.
Patres Apostolici, ed. Cotelerius, fol. Amst. 1724.
Petrus de Marca, Dissertationes Posthumæ, ed. Baluz, 8vo. Par. 1669.
Phavorinus, Lexicon Græcum. fol. Rom. 1523.
Philo Judæus, Op., ed. Mangey, fol. London, 1742.
Plutarchus, Op., ed. Reiske, 8vo. Lips. 1776.
Pollux, Julius, Onomasticon, ed. Dindorf. Lips. 1824.
Polybius, Op., ed. Schweighaüser, 8vo. Lips. 1789.
Polycarpus, S., apud Patres Apost., tom. ii.
Rabanus Maurus, Op., fol. Col. Agrip. 1626.
Renaudot, Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio. 4to. Par. 1716.
Ruffinus, Opuscula, fol. Par. 1580.
Socrates, apud Eccl. Hist. Scriptt., tom. ii.
Sozomenus, ibid.
Stephanus, Thesaurus Linguæ Græcæ, fol. Lond. 1818-26.
Stillingfleet's Works, fol. London, 1707.
Suicer, Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, fol. Amst. 1728.
Suidas, Lexicon, fol. ed. Gaisford, Oxon. 1834.
Synesius Cyrenensis, Op., ed. Petavius, fol. Par. 1631.
Tertullianus, Op., Priorii, fol. Par. 1675[c].
Theodoretus, Op., Sirmondi, fol. Par. 1642. vol. v. Auctarium, 1684.
——— Hist. Eccles. ap. Hist. Eccl. Script.
Theophylactus, Op., fol. Venet. 1754-63.
Zonaras, Comment. in Canones, apud Beveregii Pandectas.

[c] [By mistake this edition has been several times referred to in the notes as a Benedictine edition.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[AN ACCOUNT OF ADDITIONS TO THE THIRD EDITION.

	Page
THE additions made to the Christian Priesthood asserted	1
State of the controversy arising from the publication of the work	2
Bishop Trimnel's general charge of strangeness in clergy of a reformed Church advocating those doctrines, answered	3
And retorted, in the instance of resistance	4
The parallel of our episcopacy	*ib.*
I. OF THE SACRIFICE IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST.	
Dr. Hakewill's Dissertation in reply to Heylin considered	7
Heylin's Testimonies from Irenæus	*ib.*
Hakewill's comments upon them	8
Heylin's testimonies from Eusebius de Demonstratione Evangelica	9
Discussion on the meaning of the words *μνήμην ἀντὶ θυσίας*	11
Objection from definitions of Jewish sacrifices	16
From the unity and value of the oblation	*ib.*
The Eucharist is a proper sacrifice, though representative	*ib.*
That there is a material sacrifice in it proved from the Apostolical Constitutions	17
The words in the institution, 'hoc facite,' have a sacrificial signification	18
Our Lord made an oblation of the bread and cup	20
Other sacrificial terms in the account of the institution	21
Testimonies of Peter Lombard and St. Thomas Aquinas considered	22
Sense of the term 'proper' as applied to the sacrifice in the Eucharist	23
Answer to Dr. Nicholls' objection of causing divisions	24
And introducing the 'popish sacrifice of the mass'	25
Thorndike, as quoted by Bp. Trimnel, explained	27
His direct testimonies to the Eucharistic sacrifice	*ib.*
St. Chrysostom, as alleged by Bishop Trimnel, explained	28
Parallel of typical sacrifices which were yet proper ones	29
St. Chrysostom's qualification added to exalt the commemorative sacrifice	30
His positive testimony to the Eucharist being a proper sacrifice	31
Hickes leaves the subject to younger men	*ib.*
Additions to the Second Discourse	32

II. Of the Independence of the Church on the State.

Page
It is not true that the chief promoters of this doctrine are nonjurors - 32
Additions to the Appendix on this subject - - - - 33
Casaubon de Libertate Ecclesiastica - - - - - 34
Defence against the charge of magnifying the priestly office - - 35
Additions to the Appendix on this subject - - - - *ib.*

III. On the Sacerdotal power of Absolution.

Bishop Trimnel misrepresents the views of those who maintain this doctrine 36
Repentance necessary to its efficacy - - - - - *ib.*
The power ministerial only - - - - - - 37
Thorndike's statements on the Divine institution of absolution - - 38
On the general necessity of it - - - - - 39
On private confession (quoting Origen) - - - - 40
In what sense forgiveness is not from the Church - - - 41
Case of 'Clave errante' - - - - - - *ib.*
Testimony of St. Isidore Pelusiota in the case of Zosimus - - 42
Dodwell's statements on the absolute necessity of sacerdotal absolution, maintained in substance - - - - - - - 43
Hickes' apology - - - - - - - - 45
His motives for writing - - - - - - *ib.*
His desire to increase the respect of the people for the bishops and clergy of the Church - - - - - - 46

LETTER TO THE AUTHOR OF THE RIGHTS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH ASSERTED.

Design of the Prefatory Discourse - - - - - *ib.*
Author of the Rights called on to give his name - - - - 49
Hickes' principles unpopular - - - - - - 54
He is not ashamed of names given in reproach - - - 56
Profession of the principles he holds - - - - 57]

THE PREFATORY DISCOURSE IN ANSWER TO THE RIGHTS, &c.

[SECT. I.—INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSITIONS.]

Page

An account of the author's conference with a lady who had been of the Church of Rome, concerning the nature of the Christian Church - - 59

How the substance of the said conference was at her desire drawn up into Propositions - - - - - - - - - 61

Two objections afterward started against these Propositions; the one by a lawyer, the other by a divine - - - - - - - 62

The occasion of the author's writing his discourse of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order - - - - - - - - - *ib.*

The occasion of his writing that of the Christian Priesthood asserted - 63

THE PROPOSITIONS, WITH NOTES UPON THEM.

PROP. I. Of the Church as a society by Divine right - - - - *ib.*

Whence called Christ's body - - - - - note q, 64

II. Of the government and governors of this society - - - - *ib.*

Whence called God's household, &c. - - - note r, *ib.*

III. Of the episcopal dignity and jurisdiction - - - - - 65

That the bishops are the Apostles' successors, by unexceptional witnesses cleared - - - - - - - note u, *ib.*

IV. Of the Christian priesthood and ministry - - - - - 66

That Christian priests are Christ's representatives and vicars - note z, *ib.*

[SECT. II.—REAL VIEWS OF THE AUTHOR OF THE RIGHTS AND HIS PARTY.]

The occasion of publishing those Two Discourses which these Propositions gave birth to - - - - - - - - - 67

General reflections upon the method lately taken of attacking the true rights of the Christian Church, as laid down in the Propositions - - *ib.*

Nothing so needful to the understanding of the controversy between us and the Church of Rome, as a right and complete notion of the Church as a spiritual society - - - - - - - - - 60

The insolent manner of attacking the constitution of the Christian Church and priesthood by the book falsely entitled, The Rights of the Christian Church - - - - - - - - - 67

Page

A seasonable and necessary call to the clergy courageously to discharge their duty in evil times - - - - - 125, 161.

[Sect. V.]—The true Catholic Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

How it accidentally grew into disuse in this Church - - - 126
The alterations made in the order of administering it from the first liturgy of the Church of England - - - - *ib.*
The order observed herein by Bishop Overall - - - - 127
The reason of the restored rubric for reverently setting the bread and wine upon the altar - - - - - - 128
The method of anciently placing the elements first upon the paratorium or credence - - - - - - - *ib.*
Some remarks hereupon - - - - - - 129
Three reasons given for these remarks - - - - 131
A vindication of Archbishop Laud from Popish innovation - - 132
The disingenuity of the author of the Rights in charging him with what he had been fully cleared of - - - - - 135
Barely also upon the testimony of most malicious enemies - - *ib.*
Several other false charges against him revived by that author, after they were answered in the History of his Troubles - - - 136
Calumny in perfection exemplified in two points - - 137, 138
The method of wounding the Church through this archbishop's side - 138

[Sect. VI.]—Of the Church and Church Officers.

The various significations of the word Church considered and adjusted - 139
The opprobrious names by this author bestowed on the clergy animadverted upon - - - - - - - - - - 140
His reproachful insults upon the order of the Christian priesthood terminate upon Christ Himself and His Apostles - - - 121, 140
The nobility of this priesthood further asserted and vindicated - - 141
Mean extraction, or even slavery itself, no dishonour to the order - *ib.*
Priests and bishops made of slaves were anciently not the less respected *ib.*
The calumniator is sent again to Julian to be better instructed - - *ib.*
The wise and just reflection of St. Chrysostom upon this matter - 142
The story of Alexander Carbonarius and Gregorius Thaumaturgus - *ib.*

[Sect. VII.]—Of Councils and Ecclesiastical Synods.

His invidious and unchristian charge against all councils in general considered - - - - - - - - - 143
His unfair application of a saying of Gregory Nazianzen - - 144
Directly contrary to that father's intention, who was himself a known creed-maker in the Council of Constantinople - - - *ib.*
His popular fallacy in arguing from the miscarriages of councils exploded 145

Page
His excellence in a satire upon the nature of man - - - 146
What use a Mahometan would make of this false way of reasoning - *ib.*
What pretty use a Sadducee or theistical Jew might make of it - - *ib.*
How very contrary this to the conduct of Christ and of His Apostles - 147
His ridiculing of councils and synods shewn to be a libel against all senates, states, diets, and parliaments - - - - - *ib.*
Mr. Prynne's opinion of parliaments offered to his consideration - 148
Councils and parliaments both vindicated against him - - - *ib.*
Whether the canons of the one, or the statutes of the other, are to be looked on as impositions - - - - - - 149
The further prospect of this doughty author laid open - - - *ib.*
That heretical councils may be diabolically inspired - - - 150
That wicked men may be acted by wicked spirits, both separately and together; and that some writers are certainly so - - - - *ib.*
The first general council of Nice vindicated against Marvel, and this author who cites him - - - - - - - - 151
The pagan Themistius an apologist for Christians and Christian councils, against this author and his club - - - - 153
The anti-Nicene venom against priesthood and priests, and their synods, incurable - - - - - - - - 154
The objections would not be a whit less though even angels themselves should be made priests - - - - - - - - *ib.*
But rather greater - - - - - - - - *ib.*
And consequently no security from detraction or from sophistry - *ib.*
His ridiculous sophistry about sacrilege - - - - - 155
The remaining revenues of the Church the main grievance to him and men of his latitude - - - - *ib.* and 183
The false turns he has given to Church history censured - - - 156
His dishonest method in citations observed - - - - *ib.*
Six sorts of these all justly excepted against - - - - *ib.*
A notable citation out of Le Clerc against councils and creeds reflected upon 157
The Nicene faith another intolerable grievance to them - - *ib.*
This and non-resistance provoke them to write against the clergy with such bitterness - - - - - - - - 158

[Sect. VIII.]—Of Church Censures.

The power of the keys no novel High Church doctrine, but the old doctrine of the Church of England - - - - - - - 158
Nay as old as Christianity itself - - - - - - 159
That this power is not only doctrinal, but authoritative and ministerial, as asserted by the bishop of Sarum - - - - - - 158
And as is plain from the sense and practice of the primitive Christians - 159
And by consequence, that the sentences of excommunication and absolution must be not only declarative but judicial - - - *ib.*
As founded upon Christ's words and authority - - - - *ib.*
Binding and loosing by the ministry of men the same as by that of angels *ib.*
The censure of St. Ambrose upon Theodosius the Great never yet condemned by any Church, and expressly approved by our own - - - 160

Page
The true grounds of the contempt of the clergy - - - - 161
The non-user and abuser of this sacred power hence animadverted on - *ib.*
What would be the consequence of the restoration of the ancient discipline of the Church - - - - - - - - *ib.*
The sophistical way of arguing against ecclesiastical discipline from some corruptions in the exercise of it - - - - - - 162
How clergymen have been themselves, in all ages, the most severe in censuring and lamenting these corruptions - - - - *ib.*
His argument from the mal-administration of Church censures unhinges all manner of government - - - - - - 163
And is big of absurdities - - - - - - - *ib.*
That from the execution of justice in capital cases by the civil magistrate no less inconclusive - - - - - - - 164
His third and Herculean argument taken from the effect attributed to excommunication found weak and frivolous - - - - 165
The avoiding the company of excommunicates not attended with such consequences as he objects - - - - - 166
Is most consonant to the express directions and commands of our Lord and His Apostles - - - - - - - - *ib.*
Doth not discharge any one from the bonds of natural, domestic, or civil relation - - - - - - - - 168
The case of a magistrate under excommunication stated - - *ib.*
His fourth argument taken from the excommunicating persons for trifling causes examined - - - - - - - - *ib.*
His fifth, that the magistrate will not then have all the power necessary for the protection of his subjects, shewn fallacious - - - 169
His sixth, from the danger of imposition in things indifferent, and of a civil nature - - - - - - - - - 170
His ordinary fallacy of arguing against lawful power from the abuse of it *ib.*
That the Church hath power to appoint holydays, and even to give orders concerning apparel - - - - - - - *ib.*
His pretended absurdity a most laudable apostolical institution - - *ib.*
An honourable conformity herewith in a queen of France - - *ib.*
He begs the question - - - - - - - - - 171
Which is a practice very familiar with him - - - - *ib.*
His seventh argument, that such a power gives the clergy cognizance of all causes whatsoever, answered - - - - - - 172
The Church disclaims all pretence to secular jurisdiction, as suggested - *ib.*
His eighth, that it subjects the same person to undergo two trials for the same crime, enervated - - - - - - - - 173

[Sect. IX.]—Of the Power of Ordination and Deprivation.

The fallacy of his argument for lay deprivation (and consequently lay ordination) detected - - - - - - - - - 174
The consequence from putting to death to depriving never owned by the ancient Christians - - - - - - - 175
Another fallacy of his for the power of deprivation in the magistrate, which begs the question - - - - - - - - 176, 177

Page

A third fallacy as good as the former, in the case of imprisonment or banishment - - - - - - - - - 177
His loose way of disputing against the power of ordination in the Church - *ib.*
The pretended inconsistency of it with the magistrate's power to protect the commonwealth, precarious and absurd - - - - 178
He wounds himself by it, and bewrays his own cause - - - *ib.*
Also the pretended incompossibility of such a power, with the magistrate's obligation to protect the Church, disproved - - - - 179
Several fallacies and falsities more detected - - - - *ib.*
How the tables may be easily turned upon him - - - - 180
The folly and blasphemy of his Horeb contract - - - - 181
The wild notion of his state of nature - - - - - 182
His whole scheme overturned by the bishop of Sarum - - - 183

[Sect. X.]—Of Church Revenues.

The revenues of the clergy a main eye-sore to him - - - 183
His impeachment hence of the Divine wisdom for annexing such large profits and privileges too on the Jewish priesthood - - *ib.*
An observation out of Philo Judeus, whose tract concerning the rewards and honours of the priesthood is recommended to this author - *ib.*

[Sect. XI.]—The new Scheme.

His new scheme of religion utterly destructive of Christianity - - 184
It is erected on many absurdities and false suppositions - - - 185
He proves himself a creed-maker, and falls under his own condemnation - 186
His creed impartially considered, and his persecuting spirit set hereupon in a due light - - - - - - - - - *ib.*
How easily a freer thinker than himself may retort back upon him all his own reasons - - - - - - - - *ib.*
He catches himself in a noose, and plainly shews himself an enemy to the toleration - - - - - - - - - 187
And a betrayer of the subjects' liberty - - - - - 188

[Sect. XII.]—The Distinction between the Empire and the Church stated.

His method for preventing of priestcraft nothing else but mere threatening the clergy - - - - - - - - - *ib.*
His most formidable hereafter-book challenged - - - - 189
This author's method for preventing of what he calls ecclesiastical tyranny no more than a scarecrow - - - - - - - *ib.*
The heroic answer of Catholic bishops to an Arian emperor, pursuing this method - - - - - - - - - *ib.*
His confounding of the priesthood and magistracy together strikes even at Moses - - - - - - - - - 190

Page
Yea at Christ Himself - - - - - - - - 190
The distinction of clergy and laity, how old - - - - - *ib.*
The difference of the two powers certainly as old as the union of the Church and empire - - - - - - - - - *ib.*
Recognised by the greatest Christian emperors - - - - *ib.*
The declaration hereupon of the Emperor Basilius - - - *ib.*

[Sect. XIII.]—The Independency of these two Powers on each other farther proved.

1. By the difference of their originals - - - - 191
2. By their different extents - - - - - - 193
3. By the different ways by which men are admitted into them - *ib.*
4. By their different rights and privileges - - - - *ib.*
5. By the diversity of their ends and objects, &c. - - - 194
A scurrilous and blasphemous comparison reflected upon - - 192
More sophistry exposed - - - - - - - - *ib.*
The rights of naturalization and baptism most different - - - 193
The noble speech of Valentinian I. before and after the election of St. Ambrose to the bishopric of Milan - - - - - 194
The respect anciently paid from emperors to bishops, and the case of the tyrant Maximus being refused by St. Ambrose - - - 195

[Sect. XIV.—Inconsistencies in Tindal's Scheme.]

This author, in his rage against the Church, flatly contradicts his own principles - - - - - - - - - 196
He argues down all government in the state that is not purely absolute and despotical - - - - - - - - *ib.*
He puts weapons into the hands of the Church and court of Rome - - *ib.*
And of four new societies also near home - - - - - 197
While he pleads against one independency he sets up himself many independencies - - - - - - - - - *ib.*
His several independent powers in religion full as absurd and inconsistent with the civil power as he even pretends the Church power to be - *ib.*
Nay more so, and are calculated for turning kingdoms into confusion and blood - - - - - - - - - 198
By his principles any heretical sect whatsoever may and ought to rise against the prince or state, in defence of their heresy - - *ib.*
The case of the Docetes or other impure Gnostics, put - - - *ib.*
The Church claims not by Divine right a greater independency on the state than he by natural right allows every society but pretending to be a Church - - - - - - - - - 199
This instanced in the power of
1. Legislation - - - - - - - - *ib.*
2. Jurisdiction - - - - - - - - *ib.*
All religious fraternities censure their own disorderly members independently on the magistrate - - - - - - - - 200

Page
The fallacy of excluding the national Church alone from this common right 200
For the exercise but whereof our clergy are nicknamed Christian druids *ib.*
But the quakers, for exerting this independency in a far higher manner than they, are helped out by his new scheme - - - 201
This author gives them and all the sectaries another string to their bow - *ib.*
He betrays the royal supremacy, which he would seem to defend - - *ib.*
If the Church of England would but embrace his principle of natural right, 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19 would be no hindrance to her claiming the benefit of this - - - - - - - - - *ib.*
What he pulls down with one hand he builds up with another - - 202
What the magistrate may expect to gain by the change of the old for the new claim of ecclesiastical power - - - - - *ib.*

[Sect. XV.]—Of the Original of Government.

His fraudulent way of arguing from the state of nature - - - 203
1. Contrary to the history of the creation - - - - *ib.*
2. And to the common sense of mankind - - - - *ib.*
His scheme of government shewn to be wholly precarious and absurd - 204
Reflects upon God's wisdom - - - - - - 205
Is subversive of the very foundation of all governments - - 206
God's institution of government vindicated from his calumnies - - *ib.*
His sovereign and subject fairly exposed in Trincalo and Stephano - *ib.*
How kings may in different respects be mutually subjects and sovereigns *ib.*
Several instances of persons in different capacities thus superior and inferior to one another - - - - - - 207
He insults the clergy with the power in the magistrate of depriving them - 208
His arguments for that power a flat contradiction to his own scheme - *ib.*
His great kindness for the Church revenues - - - - 209
The hypocritical mockery of Harry Martin - - - - 210

The case of the Church and Clergy of England.

The Church of England would be very thankful to the state for the same privileges which the Kirk of Scotland, so much applauded by this author, enjoys by act of parliament - - - - - - 211
He licks up the spittle of a scandalous pamphlet, entitled, The Principles of the Protestant Religion explained in a Letter of Resolution, &c. - 212
His fraudulent practice in using arguments after and out of other books already confuted, without taking any notice of the answers - - *ib.*
His manifest sophistry in confounding what a man may naturally, with what he can lawfully, do - - - - - - - - 213
His notorious falsity in maintaining the primitive Christians to have done any social act by virtue of a natural right, laid open - - - *ib.*
His hypothesis of an unalienable natural right, the most precarious whim that can be - - - - - - - - - *ib.*
He has said nothing against convocations, but will serve equally against parliaments - - - - - - - - - 214
Allowance to be made for human infirmities in all - - - 215
A debate between two gentlemen, the one an enemy, the other a friend to the clergy - - - - - - - - - *ib.*

Page
His most invidious and fallacious way of speaking of them, animadverted upon - - - - - - - - - - 215
He has no argument against the ecclesiastical, but will hold as well against the regal power - - - - - - - - 216

[Sect. XVI.]—Objections against the Mission of the Clergy answered.

Why he ridicules the priests' claim of being God's ambassadors to the people *ib.*
The first objection, from the want of miraculous credentials, considered - *ib.*
1. Such credentials not likely to have been of any force with such as him - - - - - - - - - - 217
2. They might be as well required for doctrines as for mission - 218
3. The Jewish prests under the second temple had them not - 219
4. They were given at first indifferently to all believers - - - *ib.*
He and his club may demand them now of the laity, as well as of the clergy - - - - - - - - 220
His second objection, from the want of a new Gospel to discover, frivolous - *ib.*
Bishop Stillingfleet's excellent answer hereupon - - note o, *ib.*

[Sect. XVII.]—Fraudulent Citations.

His citation out of Eutychius unanswerably refuted by Abraham Echellensis, Morinus, Dr. Hammond, and Bishop Pearson - - - 221
His most disingenuous way in citing a statute of Hen. VIII. detected - 223
Several artifices and falsities in his representation of the submission of the clergy - - - - - - - - - - *ib.*
His plain misrepresentation of the recognition of the king's supremacy in 26 Hen. VIII. c. 1. - - - - - - - 226
Whereupon he is referred to the bishop of Sarum for an answer to that part of his preface which relates to the law - - - - - 227
Particularly,
1. As to the submission of the clergy, and the extent of the royal supremacy - - - - - - - - 228
2. As to the lay deprivations - - - - - - 232
His false citation of Tertullian flatly contradicting his sense - - 233
His fraud in citing Bishop Bull - - - - - - - - *ib.*
His want of ingenuity in treating this champion of the Nicene faith further exposed - - - - - - - - - 236
His evil genius appears - - - - - - - 237
His unfair practice of quoting books and passages fully answered - - *ib.*
1. Against Archbishop Laud - - - - - (135)
2. Against the Canon of Scripture - - - - - - 237
3. His story of the Culdees - - - - - - 238
4. A passage of the Tertullian de Castitate - - - *ib.*
5. Bishop Stillingfleet's Irenicum censured by himself - - 239
This bishop was his own best apologist, by other treatises written afterward 240
Four points wherein he is contrary to this author - - - - *ib.*

Page

[Sect. XVIII.—The Powers of the Church not derived from the State.]

That the Church is not a private voluntary, but a public society of Christ's institution.

His argument taken from the law for the Church's being only a private society, an errant Fourberie - - - - - - 242
Four arguments for his one - - - - - - *ib.*
The fallacy of his formidable if's - - - - - 243
And of his double entendre - - - - - - 244
A plain case put which quite overturns his whole hypothesis - - 242
His wresting the laws of the land a miserable shift - - - 244
That bishops in consecrating act not ministerially by virtue of the royal authority - - - - - - - - - *ib.*
The vanity of his argument against the original power of bishops to consecrate others - - - - - - - - - 245
His saucy manner of treating the civil magistrate - - - - 246
His own argument retorted upon himself - - - - - *ib.*
His sly pretence of defending the Church of England - - - 247
His most rare knack at wheedling the clergy - - - - *ib.*
Some notable instances more of his fallacious citing authors to serve his own turn, viz., - - - - - - - - - 248
1. My Lord Clarendon against Cressy - - - - *ib.*
2. Dr. Barrow of the pope's supremacy - - - - 249
3 Gomarus and Gualterus about the same - - - 250
4. Dr. Scott's Christian Life - - - - - *ib.*
The true independent power of the Church vastly different from the false independent power of the pope - - - - - - 249
The security of the prince and state how hereby best provided for - - 250
His dishonesty and malice in joining with papists, the greatest enemies to popery - - - - - - - - - 251
His method of writing admirably calculated for
1. A Treatise against Christianity, by a Veteran Atheist - - *ib.*
2. A Treatise against the Profession of the Law - - - 252
3. Another against Monarchy, and the Civil Magistrate - - *ib.*
His inconsistency in stretching the prince's supremacy in spirituals, whom he makes a servant to the people in temporals - - - *ib.*
His civil Demogorgon and Polyphemus reflected on - - - 253
The pernicious consequences of his subjecting the prince to the last resort of the people - - - - - - - - - *ib.*
His dishonest way of quoting acts of parliament farther exemplified - *ib.*
That the clergy derive not their power of inflicting spiritual censures from the state - - - - - - - - - 254
How far the sentence of the spiritual judge ought to respect the secular magistrate - - - - - - - - - 256

[Sect. XIX.—On the Sacerdotal Office and Ordination.]

His mobbish arguments against the office and order of priesthood, confuted by his own very concessions - - - - - *ib.*

Page
He is more free in his allowance to the people, than to God Himself - 257
How a question of fact is to be determined - - - - 258
The difference betwixt what any man can do, and what he can do in a sacerdotal ministerial manner, stated - - - - - *ib.*
His arguing against the Christian priesthood, the same with that of Corah - 259
And is of as much force against all orders of men in the state, as well as in the Church - - - - - - - - 260
A limitation of his, by which he confutes his own argument - - *ib.*
How good he is at contradicting himself - - - - - *ib.*
His most profane applying of the term conjuration - - - *ib.*
His ridiculing of the consecration of bishops, and ordination of priests, vile and blasphemous - - - - - - - 261
Baptism as well as ordination by his sarcasms, made to be a solemn mockery - - - - - - - - - *ib.*
His artifice to wound the Church of England through the sides of the popish clergy - - - - - - - - 262
His ironical vindication of our clergy - - - - - 263
No such office in the Church of England for the election of bishops, as he mentions, ever before heard of - - - - - *ib.*
His scurrility and blasphemy animadverted upon - - - *ib.*
His mocking at the clergy as if they made God their executioner, and put themselves in His place - - - - - - 264
His heathenish liberty in speaking of the several persons of the blessed Trinity - - - - - - - - - 265
A passage of his concerning heathenish inspiration applied home - - 266

[Sect. XX.]—Of the Divine Institution of Bishops.

His first Herculean argument against it an old popular fallacy - - 268
His second, false in fact: and if true, proves so much as it plainly proves nothing at all - - - - - - - - 269
His third, most invidious and absurd, and impeaches the Divine goodness as well as wisdom - - - - - - - - *ib.*
His fourth, no better than mere clamour, and that many times answered - *ib.*
That no strict doctrines are to be rejected for the severity of their consequences - - - - - - - - - 270
That this doctrine in particular, unchurches none; but that they unchurch themselves, who throw off a government of God's institution - - 271
Who they are that weaken most the Protestant cause, and widen the distance among Protestants - - - - - - - - *ib.*
The plea of necessity considered - - - - - - *ib.*
A most serious and compassionate exhortation to the Protestant Churches abroad, to perfect their reformation upon catholic principles - 272-277
A noble passage of St. Ignatius to the Christians of Smyrna - - 273
Principles may easily be broken, but cannot be bent - - - 275
Tenderness for all the reformed Churches, and particularly for the French, testified - - - - - - - - - 277
An appeal to what the author has preached and printed for them - *ib.*

Page
The ill design herein of this writer upon them discovered; and his main objection answered - - - - - - 276
The principles upon which the Church of England reformed not to be violated - - - - - - - - 277
Whether they that wilfully abdicate episcopacy, and plead it their duty so to do, deserve the name of a Church - - - - - 278
A prayer for those that are in such a state - - - - *ib.*
That he may but load a Catholic principle with invectives, he even contradicts the foundation of his whole work - - - - 279
His charging this principle (1.) As destructive to the presbyterian Church of Scotland, examined - - - - - - - *ib.*
(2.) As not favourable to the revolution, considered - - 280
His own opinion full as destructive to the Scottish presbyterian Church as this can be - - - - - - - 279
By his way of reasoning, the presbyterians, both English and Scotch, must have no favourable opinion of the revolution - - - 280
Some figures of his rhetoric reflected upon - - - - *ib.*

[Sect. XXI.]—Of an uninterrupted succession of Bishops in the Catholic Church.

The Church of Rome, in what sense a true Church, and in what not - 281
The objection against our deriving succession from the said Church answered - - - - - - - - - 282
And this answer never yet replied to - - - - - *ib.*
The weak apology of the French ministers, when pressed by the Papists to shew their mission - - - - - - - 283
The reason why the Lord Chancellor Clarendon never would communicate with the French Protestants - - - - - *ib.*
A citation out of that noble historian by this writer impertinent to his purpose - - - - - - - - 284
For which he is referred to another that is more pertinent - - *ib.*
How Bishop Morley and others refused communion with them on the same account - - - - - - - - *ib.*
Three reasons for declining an answer to what he has transcribed out of the Bishop of Sarum's Exposition of the Twenty-third Article - - 285
Some queries humbly offered to his lordship's serious consideration on that subject - - - - - - 287—291
His lordship's character of episcopacy recommended - - - 291

[Sect. XXII.]—Of the Unity and Original Rights of the Catholic Church.

The interests of popery how and by whom best served - - - 293
His fallacy in confounding the notion of the unity of the Catholic Church, by comparing national Churches with the government of independent kingdoms - - - - - - - - *ib.*

Page
Why Christians all the world over make but one body politic in ecclesiastics 295
His first argument against this answered - - - - - 296
His second argument examined - - - - - - *ib.*
Comparisons to set forth the unity hereof according to the reasonings of the New Testament - - - - - - - - *ib.*
His mad attempt to have many independent Churches of natural right, instead of one Holy Catholic Church of Divine right - - - 298
The prejudices and objections against this principle of unity in the Church of England considered - - - - - - - *ib.*
His ridiculous essay to batter down Church unity and episcopal ordination by act of parliament - - - - - - - *ib.*
His repeated attack against episcopal consecrations - - - *ib.*
He makes very strange work with præmunire - - - - 299
Some other queries put hereupon to him to answer - - - *ib.*
His crambe objection dismissed, with three notable interrogations for him to chew upon - - - - - - - - 300
His art of smuggling what makes against him - - - - 301
An assertion of his against reason and fact - - - - *ib.*
Authorities of lawyers and records to prove that our kings have sat and administered justice in their courts of judicature - 302, sqq. 316
Another bundle of queries for him to answer, upon his scheme of consecration derived solely from the crown - - - - - - 305
His argument from penal restraints most trifling and false - - *ib.*
An answer to his objections from the act of submission, in the words of the bishop of Lincoln and of Dr. Kennett - - - 306, 307
All his arguments against Church government sophistical, and plainly against fact - - - - - - - - 308
A judicious observation of Spalatensis - - - - note m, *ib.*
Some authors referred to for full satisfaction herein - - - 309
His fanatical objection of a popedom being unavoidable from the episcopal constitution of Church government exploded - - - *ib.*
His extravagant way of arguing, in contradiction to plain fact, and consentient testimony of Churches - - - - - - *ib.*
His calumny upon the English clergy for carrying the power of the Church as high as the papists, reflected on - - - - - 310
His notorious misapplication of authors to serve a turn - - - 311
How he perverts the words of Mr. Chillingworth - - - - *ib.*
Reflections upon a saying of King Charles II. cited by him, and upon another of one whom he calls a reverend divine - - - 312
His challenge accepted - - - - - - - - *ib.*
His seeking protection from the laity reflected on - - - *ib.*
A strange paradox and riddle from him - - - - - 314
Some of his contradictions taken notice of - - - - *ib.*
His scurrilous language given the clergy - - - - 315
His fallacious representation of the spiritual power as the occasion of all mischiefs to mankind - - - - - - - *ib.*
Nothing so good but it may be the accidental cause of evil - - *ib.*
His objection from the parliament's authorizing thirty-two persons to establish ecclesiastical laws, answered by Dr. Fuller and Dr. Atterbury - 317
His objection of a parliamentary religion whence borrowed - - 318

Page
His popish design detected - - - - - 310, 318
His pretty artifice in bringing the arguments of the Church of Rome against the Church of England - - - - 293, 310, 318
His republican design manifested - - - - - 318
His notion of natural freedom contrary to the law of nations which introduced slavery, and to the Scriptures - - - - *ib.*

[Sect. XXIII.]—Observations and Reflections upon the whole.

General reflections upon the method, originals, and scope of this masterpiece of antichristian heresy - - - - - 319
The author's satisfaction and comfort in the many lies and libels upon him by infidels - - - - - - - - - 321
His apologetic for what he has written about the ancient order of the communion office - - - - - - - - *ib.*
And for the observation of the restored Rubric, and the use also of the Paratorium - - - - - - - - 322
A word in season to Dr. Hancock and to some besides - - - 324
His humble and serious address to the clergy - - - - 325
His design of a paræsnesis to the candidates of the priesthood - - 326
A reflection made upon the author for crying out of the times, fairly considered - - - - - - - - - 327
An appeal to, and vindication of, the primitive fathers, with the holy prophets also and Apostles, upon this charge - - - - 329
What it is that some think fit to call blackening the times - - 330
The attempts of atheists and deists not altogether so despicable as pretended 331
Critical and miscellaneous remarks interspersed. 1. Terms of exception not always taken in an exclusive, but sometimes in a comparative sense, 91, note b. 2. The proper difference of hostia and victima; and 3. The distinction of the Eucharistical oblation before and after the consecration in St. Cyprian, 96, note b. 4. The difference of ara and altare, 96, note e, and 122, note a. 5. Of *θυσιαστήριον* and *βωμὸς*, 122, note a. 6. Different senses of propitiation and propitiatory, 109, note n. 7. And of sacraments, 110, note q. 8. *πρόθεσις*, 129, note y. 9. Credenza, 129, 130, note b. 10. *προσφορὰ* for the holy communion, 327. 11. The *ἱερὰ δεῖπνα* of the gods in Pollux, 118, note q. 12. Excommunication errante clave, 181, note u. 13. Mysteries of Mithra, 119, note s. 14. Parliaments, 148, note z.
Occasional remarks upon the growth of deism, &c. The arguments of Hobbes, Selden, Spinoza, and Marvel against the true rights of the Church, where answered, 67, note a; 69, note h. And by whom licked up again, 67, 320. Some late books censured that strike at the very root of Christianity, 79, note s. Where to find an antidote against them, 320, 326. Mr. Le Clerc, 157, note j. Mr. Ob. Walker, 227. Dr. Hancock, 322, note z. Bishop Trimnel, 327—331. The Christian Priesthood constantly supposed by the book of Ordination, and by the Liturgy and Rubrics of the Church of England, 106. That spiritual governors must deliver their own souls, 329. The most proper course in evil times, *ib.*

Page

Honourable mention made of Dr. Atterbury, 223, 224, 308, 317. Dr. Barrow, 249. Bishop Beveridge, 326. Bishop Bilson, 267. Bishop Bull, 237, 326. Bishop Fox of Hereford, 162, note y. Dr. Grabe, 237, &c. Dr. Hammond, 326. Mr. Nelson, 314. Bishop Parker, 67, 326. Bishop Pearson, 250. Bishop Stillingfleet, 220, note o. Bishop Wake, 306, note f. Sir George Wheeler, 129. A notable passage of Livy upon the times, 330.

The author's conclusion and address to the bishops and clergy in the words of Hugo Floriacensis - - - - - - - 332

AN ACCOUNT OF THIS THIRD EDITION OF THE FOLLOWING BOOK, AND THE ADDITIONS THEREIN; WHEREIN DR. HAKEWILL'S DISSERTATION WITH DR. HEYLIN TOUCHING THE PRETENDED SACRIFICE IN THE EUCHARIST, IS ANSWERED; WITH SOME OBSERVATIONS AND STRICTURES UPON THE CHARGE, WHICH THE BISHOP OF NORWICH DELIVERED TO THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE, AT A VISITATION IN THE YEAR 1709 [a].

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

I THINK myself obliged to give some account of the additions in every part of this book, by which in this edition it is augmented into two volumes. I shall begin with the first treatise of The Christian Priesthood, in which something hath been added in almost every page of the former editions, but more especially from the thirty-eighth to the sixty-fifth page, where I treated of the Christian sacrifice or oblation in the holy Eucharist; and what in them took up but fourteen leaves, in this edition printed in the same types takes up fifty-two, from page 42 to page 146[b]. Where, as I promised elsewhere[c], and another[d] hath promised for me, I have

[a] [Dr. Charles Trimnel, bishop of Norwich, delivered a charge at his primary visitation in 1709, which was published at the request of the clergy in the following year. After reflecting on the book called The Rights of the Christian Church, &c., he considers three "opinions that have been revived of late with some zeal in behalf of the clergy. . . . The independence of the Church upon the State; the power of offering sacrifices, properly so called; and the power of forgiving sins;" as having been chiefly put forward "by those of the late separation," pp. 5, 6. He referred, p. 13, to Hakewill's work against Heylin. See below, p. 6. He became bishop of Winchester in 1721, and died 1723.

Heylin had published in 1637, Antidotum Lincolniense, or an answer to a book entitled, the Holy Table name and thing, which book was a reply by Williams, bishop of Lincoln, to Heylin's former work, A Coal from the Altar: or an answer to the Bishop of Lincoln's letter to the Vicar of Grantham against placing the Communion-table in the manner of an Altar, 1636. In sect. ii. c. 5, 6 of the Antidotum Lincolniense he treats of the Eucharistic sacrifice. In 1641 Dr. George Hakewill, rector of Exeter college, and archdeacon of Surrey, published a reply to it, of which there was a second edition in 1645.]

[b] [That is, of the third edition, being the sections 6—9 and part of sect. 10 of the second chapter of The Christian Priesthood.]

[c] In the epistle to the reader, before the Second Collection of Controversial Letters, [relating to the Church of England and to the Church of Rome, by George Hickes, D.D., printed for Richard Sare at Gray's Inn Gate in Holborn, 1710. This Preface is wholly in reply to Dr. Hancock's Answer; (see note g of the following page): p. xv. he says, "as I am preparing a third edition of my two treatises . . . so . . . I shall (in it) without any other defence obviate rather than answer his chief objections."]

[d] [The Rev. Hilkiah Bedford, A.M., in] A seasonable and modest apology in behalf of Dr. George Hickes and other Non-Jurors; in a letter to Th. Wise, D.D. [on occasion of his late Visitation Sermon, &c. The author was engaged in translating Casaubon's treatise (Appendix, No. vi.) for

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

shewed from the unanimous and universal tradition of the ancient Catholic Church, that the holy Eucharist like other material oblations, was deemed a sacrifice, in which the bread and wine was really and literally offered up to God the Father; and that the ancient doctrine and belief of its being a proper sacrifice, is at least as plainly founded in the Scriptures of the New Testament, as several other doctrines which those, who are so unwilling to embrace this, believe upon the consentient universal tradition of the same Catholic Church. To pass over what Dr. Wise hath said in his Visitation Sermon [e], as not worthy of farther notice than hath been already taken of it [f]; two other persons of the contrary opinion have written against it since the last edition of my book, to wit, Dr. Hancock in two tracts mentioned in the margin [g], and Bishop Trimnel in his Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Norwich. But they have both received such a full and solid answer from an unknown very judicious and learned hand, in a book entitled, The propitiatory Oblation in the Holy Eucharist, &c.[h] that

Dr. Hickes: in it he says, "I hear he has put his discourse of the Christian Priesthood, &c., a third time to press. . . . This edition will I understand be enlarged very much in behalf of the Eucharistical oblation. . . ." p. 4. London, 1710. Dr. Wise replied in a work called, The Christian Eucharist rightly stated, and a rejoinder was published, entitled, A Vindication of the Rev. Dr. George Hickes, and the author of the seasonable and modest apology, from the undeserved reflections of the Rev. Dr. Thomas Wise in his book entituled, &c. London, Morphew, 1712, by a Presbyter of the Church of England. Both the Apology and Vindication are attributed to Hickes himself in the note to the article on his life in the General Dictionary.]

[e] [It was called, The faithful stewards, or the pastoral duty, preached at Canterbury, June 1, 1710.]

[f] In a letter to the Doctor, entitled, A seasonable and modest apology in behalf of Dr. George Hickes, and other Non-Jurors. London, printed for Sam. Keble, 1710.

[g] An answer to some things contained in Dr. Hickes's Christian Priesthood [asserted, and in his preface, concerning the Christian Sacrifice. By a Presbyter of the Church of England. London, 1709.] and Patres Vindicati [designed as a supplement to a book entitul'd, An answer to some things, &c. By John Hancock, D.D., author of the said book. London, 1709. The first work was anonymous. Dr. Hancock was rector of St. Margaret's, Lothbury, and was one of the four London clergy (Hoadly being another) who refused to join in the address of the bishop and clergy to the queen in 1710. He had preached the Boyle Lectures in 1706.]

[h] London, printed for John Morphew near Stationers' Hall, 1710. [The Propitiatory Oblation in the Holy Eucharist truly stated and defended from Scripture, antiquity, and the communion service of the Church of England . . . in which some notice is taken of Dr. Hancock's answer to Dr. Hickes. This pamphlet was written by John Johnson, author of the Unbloody Sacrifice, "anonymously to avoid offence." After it was written, Bishop Trimnel's Charge was published; and as he had animadverted on some passages in the Clergyman's Vade Mecum, (the notes on the 2nd Apostolical Canon,) which had also been published anonymously, in 1705 and 1707, Johnson replied in

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

I might have been excused, had I not added one word to what I had written upon that subject, in the former editions of The Christian Priesthood. However, I thought all learned men, interested in this controversy, would expect something more from me upon this subject; and I hope that I have now said enough to make it appear, that all the ancient Churches believed the bread and wine to be the proper subject matter of the Christian oblation in the holy Eucharist, or the sensible things which they really offered, and believed ought to be really offered, to God in that holy service, for the sacrificial feast; and by consequence that they thought it to be an outward sacrifice properly so called. In these additions I have also tacitly answered the most material objections of those two authors against the Christian sacrifice, as they themselves, or any other persons versed in their writings, may perceive; and I hope the latter, when he hath read them, will not think it so "new or unaccountable, that the presbyters of a reformed Church should lay claim to it[i]," as his lordship expresses himself. Surely they have a right to claim that which the prelates of the whole Catholic Church claimed, and to which bishops themselves were expressly ordained, viz., to offer up the bread and cup in that holy Sacrament, as I have shewed[j] from the most ancient form of consecration; and that they ought to esteem that as an honour, which I have shewed was so often singled out as the most honourable part of the priest's office, even of the episcopal office itself. Wherefore the bishop objects to little purpose, that this doctrine of 'offering a proper sacrifice in the Eucharist[k]' "hath been revived of late for advancing the honour of the clergy:" but it is not any matter,

a long postscript. To this Trimnel sent out an answer in a second edition of his Charge in 1713, to which Johnson replied in the Prefatory Epistle addressed to the bishop of Norwich, prefixed to the Unbloody Sacrifice, in 1714, in which, p. 5, he acknowledges himself the author of this pamphlet and the Vade Mecum.]

[i] Visitation Charge, p. 13.

[j] Christian Priesthood, [ch. ii. sect. 10. § 6.]

[k] ["The second opinion, which has been revived of late, for advancing the honour of the clergy, with as little foundation and as little probability of success as the former, (viz. that of the independence of the Church upon the State,) is that of their being appointed to offer a proper sacrifice in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. That the priests of the Romish communion should pretend to this power is no wonder at all, but it is pretty new and somewhat unaccountable, that the presbyters of a reformed Church should lay claim to it."—Visitation Charge, p. 13.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

how lately it hath been revived, or by whom, or for what end, so it be true and catholic, *quod ab omnibus, quod ubique, quod semper,* as I hope I have proved it to be. His lordship also tells his clergy, that "it is advanced with as little foundation and as little probability of success as that of the independence of the Church upon the State." To which I answer first, that if it hath but as good a foundation as the independence of the Church upon the State, its foundation is very sure in the Scriptures, fathers, and councils, as he may see in Is. Casaubon's Tract *De Libertate Ecclesiastica,* which I have published in the Appendix[l] for my own justification, and I hope for his lordship's satisfaction. As for the success of either doctrine, that is in the hands of God; but his lordship must be little acquainted with the world, if he doth not know there are considerable numbers amongst the most learned who believe both, and particularly that of the Eucharistical sacrifice, as he hath found by The Propitiatory Oblation[m], and the proœmial Dissertation of Mr. Hughes before *S. Chrysost. de Sacerdotio,* translated into English in the Appendix[n]; and may also find by the living testimonies of others I have produced[o]. And if his lordship will do me the honour to believe me, I can assure him there are very many more of the best authority and reputation, both among the clergy and laity too, besides Mr. Nelson[p], who believe this doctrine; and I beseeeh his lordship to consider, if it is so new or so unaccountable for the presbyters of a reformed Church to assert it, as for bishops[q] and presbyters of the Church

[l] [Appendix, No. vi.]

[m] [John Johnson was then rector of Cranbrook, and proctor for the diocese of Canterbury. He is alluded to also in the Vindication of Dr. Hickes and the author of the Seasonable and Modest Apology, "Is it not evidently the doctrine of jurors too, and hath not one of them, a person of great worth and learning, lately written a very judicious book in defence of it called the Propitiatory Oblation?"—pp. 30, 31. London, 1712.]

[n] [Appendix, No. viii.]

[o] In the Preface and Appendix, [No. vii.]

[p] [See The great duty of frequenting the Christian Sacrifice, by Robert Nelson, published in 1707.]

[q] [In the previous year, 1710, at Dr. Sacheverell's trial, "Talbot, bishop of Oxford, Wake, bishop of Lincoln, Trimnel, bishop of Norwich, and myself, spoke on the other side. We shewed the falsehood of an opinion too commonly received, that the Church of England has always condemned resistance."—Burnet's Own Times, ii. 544. fol. 1734. Their chief argument, as stated by Burnet, (ibid.,) was that the English government had, during several reigns, assisted the French Protestants in their wars against their kings, and that convocation had voted subsidies for the purpose.

In a sermon preached before the house of lords, Feb. 17, 1708, p. 5. Bp. Trimnel spoke of resistance to ar-

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

of England to assert the doctrine of resistance, which is as plainly condemned by her in all cases, or for any cause, as these, and many such like words and sentences, can express. When my lord can bring me half as many, or half as plain texts of Scripture against the Eucharistical oblation, as I can bring against resistance; or prove it not to have been the doctrine of the ancient Catholic Church, from half as many, or half as plain testimonies of fathers and councils, as I have proved it was; then I will believe with Mr. Hoadly[r], that resistance of sovereign powers is not only lawful, but laudable; and that it is our duty to resist and depose them, when they do not answer the ends of government, and a damnable sin in that case not to resist. I think it very strange for any bishop or presbyter of the Church of England to oppose a doctrine which is so apparently founded in Scripture, and supported by antiquity, universality, and consent, and yet embrace another which is neither warranted by Scripture or tradition, but expressly condemned by both, as well as by that Church of which they are priests. And if it be an argument against the oblation of the bread and wine in the Eucharist, that Mr. Mede and Dr. Heylin were the first writers of the reformed Churches that published this doctrine, as the bishop[s] from Dr. Hakewill[t] observes; how

bitrary power as "a cause so laudable in itself that they stand recorded with the highest honour in the history of all ages and nations, who have gone farthest in maintaining the freedom of their country, &c." Jan. 30th, 1711-12, he preached a sermon before the house of lords, which gave such offence that the usual vote of thanks was not passed. It was published with a defence in 1713.]

[r] [In a Sermon preached before the lord mayor on Michaelmas day, 1705, reprinted in the same year with a defence, entitled, Measures of submission to the civil magistrate considered. London, 1705.

"Supposing it is true, that governors act contrary to the end of their institution; invade the rights of their subjects; and attempt the ruin of that society over which they are placed; it is lawful, and glorious for these subjects to consult the happiness of the public, and of their posterity after them, by opposing and resisting such governors."—Def. of Serm. c. i. Hoadly's Works, vol. ii. p. 37. London, 1773.]

[s] ["Though I am not aware of any error in Dr. Hakewill's affirming Dr. Heylin to have been the first among the reformed that published to the world the doctrine of a proper sacrifice in the Eucharist; yet it must be acknowledged, that the learned Mr. Mede's Discourse upon that subject since published was made about that time, if not a little before it."—Visitation Charge, p. 15. Heylin's work was published in 1637. His preface is dated May 10. Mede died in 1638. His treatise, On the Christian Sacrifice, was first published in 1648, but a small tract, Of the name Altar or *θυσιαστήριον*, anciently given to the holy table, written as a chapel common-place in 1635, containing the same doctrine, was published in 1637. Imprimatur 17 cal. Jul. 1637.]

[t] ["He (Dr. Heylin) is the first of the reformed Churches who ever published this doctrine."—Hakewill's Diss.

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

much a better argument is it against the doctrine of resistance that those among us, whom I need not name, were the first writers of the Church of England owning her communion, that contrary to her doctrine, their own subscriptions to it, the testimony of her martyrs, and the whole torrent of her writers since the Reformation, published that doctrine, which if it be false must needs be damnable; whereas the doctrine of the Eucharistical oblation, as taught by me after Mr. Mede and others, if it be not true, is but a harmless error, for the belief and practice of which no man shall endanger his soul? But indeed it is no argument at all against the Eucharistical sacrifice, were it true, that Mede and Heylin were the first publishers of it in our Church, unless my lord will acknowledge it to be an argument against his own order, that of all the reformed Churches, the Church of England was the first, and almost the only one which hath retained episcopacy, and taught that it was to be continued in the Church[u]. How therefore, how can it be an argument against an old catholic doctrine and practice, that it is at any time revived and published where it happens to be forgot, neglected, or disused? Though I grant his lordship, it is a very strong argument against any doctrine and practice, and particularly that of resistance—of which catholic antiquity was not only entirely silent, but full of testimonies to the contrary—and the difference of the two cases is so great, that I may presume to tell his lordship, and I hope without offence, that the doctrine of the Christian sacrifice in the Eucharist needs fear no censure; but that of resistance, as it deserves censure, so it hath just reason to fear it, and will, I trust, sooner or later feel the censures of the Church[x].

p. 3. Heylin, (Antidotum Lincolniense, sect. ii. c. v. p. 32,) referred to Bps. Andrewes, Answer to Cardinal Perron, c. 6, Morton, Of the Romish Sacrifice, b. vi. c. 5, and Montague, Appello Cæsarem, p. 287.]

[u] Preface before the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons.

[x] [This was written after Dr. Sacheverell's trial, in 1711, when there was a strong popular feeling in favour of the doctrine of non-resistance, and the "Church party" were predominant in the ministry and parliament, as well as in the lower house of convocation. Some years previously Hoadly's sermon had been presented for censure by the lower house of convocation. . . . . "They do in the last place earnestly desire your lordships that some synodical notice may be taken of the dishonour done to the Church by a sermon preached by Mr. Benjamin Hoadly, at St. Lawrence Jewry, Sept. 29, 1705, containing positions contrary to the doctrine of the Church, expressed in the first and second parts of the homily against disobedience or wilful rebellion."—A letter of the lower house

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

But his lordship saith that "Dr. Hakewill in his Dissertation hath shewn that neither the Scriptures, nor the authority of the fathers, do warrant any such notion[y]." But I appeal to any unprejudiced person, who will compare what I have written upon this subject with what Dr. Hakewill hath said against it, whether he hath shewn, or could shew, that there is no notion of a visible, true, and proper sacrifice in the Scriptures and fathers, as sacrifice signifies an oblation of a sensible or visible gift to God. The Doctor only pretends to prove that neither Irenæus nor Eusebius, cited by Heylin, are to be understood of a sacrifice properly so called. But Dr. Heylin proves it also from other authorities, as those of St. Ignatius[z], Justin Martyr[a], Tertullian[b], Cyprian[c], of which Hakewill takes no notice. As to Irenæus, Dr. Heylin cited only two passages out of him, which are in Latin, in lib. iv. cap. 34, the first[d] of them is thus a little abbreviated: *Non genus oblationum reprobatum est; oblationes enim et illic, oblationes autem et hic: sacrificia in populo, sacrificia et in Ecclesia: sed species immutata est tantum, quippe cum jam non a servis sed a liberis offeratur*[e]. But this passage Dr. Hakewill passes over, I need not stick to say because it was too hard for him, especially as attended with other passages he could not solve; as, *Ecclesiæ oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum, et acceptum ei est: non quod indigeat a nobis sacrificium, sed quoniam is qui offert, glorificatur ipse in eo quod offert, si acceptetur munus ejus. Per munus enim erga regem, et honos, et affectio ostenditur: quod in omni simplicitate et innocentia Dominus volens vos offerre, prædicavit dicens, 'cum igitur offers*[f] *munus tuum ad altare,'*

(of convocation) to the archbishop and bishops about books and writings. (Feb. 19, 1705-6.) Wilkins' Concilia, vol. iv. pp. 633, 634.]

[y] Visitation Charge, p. 13.

[z] [Antidotum Lincolniense, sect. 2. cap. v. pp. 9, 10.]

[a] [Ibid., sect. 2. cap. v. p. 10.]

[b] [Ibid., sect. 2. cap. v. p. 12.]

[c] [Ibid., sect. 2. cap. v. p. 14.]

[d] [Ibid., sect. 2. cap. v. p. 11.]

[e] [Contra Hæreses, lib. iv. cap. xviii. § 2. p. 250.]

[f] "'Hunc Evangelii locum de Eucharistiæ oblatione cum Irenæo interpretantur B. Clemens Rom. lib. ii. Constit. Apost., cap. lviii. (lvii.) [Concil., tom. i. pp. 289, 290, E.] Optatus Milevitanus, lib. vi. contra Parmenianum, [Op. p. 111.] Cyrillus Hieros. 5. Catechesis mystagogica. [p. 326. B.]' Feuardentius. Dicti enim, ut et alii auctores, memorant ritum Ecclesiæ, quo per diaconos hortabatur fideles ad S. Eucharistiam accessuros, ne cum inimicitia vel discordia ad altare venirent, in hoc servatoris præcepto utique fundatum. Et sane cum hoc contineatur eximio isto sermone, quo novam Legem, aut veterem renovatam, fidelibus

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

&c.[g] There are many more such literal passages in that chapter, besides what that father had said in the chapter preceding: as, *Sed et suis discipulis dans consilium, primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi, nec ingrati sint, eum qui ex creatura est panis, accepit, et gratias egit, dicens: Hoc, &c. Et calicem similiter, &c. Et novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem; quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo, &c.*[h] The other passage which Heylin[i] uses is this: *Offerimus ei, non quasi indigenti, sed gratias agentes donationi*[k] *ejus, et sanctificantes creaturam*[l]. This passage the Doctor cited to shew only what kind of sacrifice the Eucharistical was, to wit, a sacrifice of gratitude and thanksgiving, whereof the materials, viz., the bread and wine, were sanctified or consecrated by the priest. To this Dr. Hakewill saith nothing what became him, but in a most futile manner replies, "But is any man so weak as from thence to infer a sacrifice properly so called? The sanctifying [or blessing,] or consecrating [of] the bread to holy uses, we all grant to be the proper office of the priest or presbyter, and the giving of thanks common to him and the people, but that either of these is a sacrifice properly so called, that we deny and desire to see proved[m]." But did not the Doctor know that the consecration of the bread, and giving of thanks, to which Heylin observed *offerimus* relates, was of the bread as of an offering, as a *munus* or gift to God, and an oblation of the New Testament? Besides the passages just now cited out of Irenæus, these which follow in the same chapter prove it most expressly: *Oportet enim nos oblationem Deo facere . . . . hanc ob-*

suis observandam promulgavit; non tam Mosaicas oblationes cum altari et templo brevi abolendas, sed altare ac sacrificium Ecclesiæ jamjam instituendum præcipue respexisse, ac tale supposuisse videtur, quale etiam in Christianorum cœtibus fuisse, non solum Irenæus et antiquior Ignatius, sed et ipse Apostolus testatur Heb. xiii. 10. scribens: Habemus altare, ex quo edendi non habent potestatem qui tabernaculo deserviunt. [Extra Judæorum itaque templum in Ecclesia erat θυσιαστήριον altare,] et per consequens etiam θυσία sacrificium, non solum rationale laudis et precum, sed et materiale panis et vini, quod verbo *edendi* clare significat Apostolus."—Grabe in locum. [S. Iren. contra Hæreses, lib. iv. cap. xxxiv. p. 324. ed. Grabe. Oxon. 1702.]

[g] [Id. ibid., cap. xviii. § 1. p. 250. ed. Bened.]

[h] [Id. ibid., cap. xxxii. p. 323. ed. Grabe—cap. xvii. § 5. p. 249. ed. Bened. . . . qui ex creatura panis est.]

[i] [Heylin, Antid. Linc., sect. ii. cap. v. p. 11.]

[k] ["dominationi." Grabe et ed. Bened.]

[l] [S. Iren., contra Hæreses, cap. xviii. § 6. p. 251. ed. Bened.]

[m] [Hakewill's Diss., cap. iv. p. 23.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

lationem Ecclesia sola pura[n] *offert Fabricatori, offerens ei cum gratiarum actione ex creatura ejus*[o]. So *Quemadmodum enim qui est a terra panis percipiens invocationem Dei, jam non communis panis est, sed Eucharistia, ex duabus rebus constans, terrena et cœlesti: sic &c.*[p] And what this invocation was at the oblation of the creatures of bread and wine, and how they were joined together in the holy action, though I have shewed it abundantly in the additions to the Christian Priesthood, yet I shall by and by have occasion to mention it again.

As to the other authority out of the tenth chapter of the first book of Eusebius, *de Demonstratione Evangelica*, Dr. Heylin makes use of the five following passages[q], whereof this is the first[r]. "When therefore, according to the testimonies of the prophets, this great and precious price of redemption was found both for Jews and Greeks, when this piacle for the whole world, this *ἀντίψυχον*[s] for all men, this pure sacrifice for all vice and sin was found, to wit, the Lamb of God, that most holy Sheep acceptable to God, that Lamb foretold by the prophets, by whose divine and mystical doctrine, all we of the Gentiles have found remission of our former sins; and those of the Jews who trust in Him, are freed from the curse of Moses' law; daily celebrating, as they ought, the memory of His body and blood, being counted worthy of a more excellent sacrifice and ministry than any in ancient times[t]." The second passage is this: "Then he

[n] ["puram." ed. Bened.]

[o] [S. Iren., ibid., cap. xviii. § 4. p. 251.]

[p] [*Ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἔκκλησιν* (*ἐπίκλησιν* malem) *τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου· οὕτως κ. τ. λ.*—Id. ibid., § 5. p. 251.]

[q] [Antid. Linc., sect. ii. cap. v. p. 22—24. Heylin (p. 22) cites one more passage from Eusebius: *εὐχόντας δὲ (πᾶν γένος τῶν πρὶν εἰδωλολατρῶν ἀνθρώπων) οὐκέτι πλείοσι κυρίοις, ἑνὶ δὲ τῷ μόνῳ Κυρίῳ κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν λόγιον,* (Isa. xix. 19.) *καὶ τούτῳ θυσιαστήριον ἀναίμων καὶ λογικῶν θυσιῶν, κατὰ τὰ καίνα μυστήρια τῆς νέας καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης, καθ' ὅλης τῆς ἀνθρώπων οἰκουμένης ἀνεγήγερται.*—De Dem. Evang., lib. i. cap. vi. p. 20, B, C.]

[r] [Hickes gives the translation of the whole passage, Heylin abridges it.]

[s] i. e. this sacrifice given for the souls of all men.

[t] [*Ὅτε τοίνυν κατὰ τὰς τῶν προφητῶν μαρτυρίας εὕρηται τὸ μέγα καὶ τίμιον λύτρον Ἰουδαίων ὁμοῦ καὶ Ἑλλήνων, τὸ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου καθάρσιον, πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀντίψυχον, τὸ πάσης κηλῖδος καὶ ἁμαρτίας καθαρὸν ἱερεῖον, ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ θεοφιλὲς καὶ ἄγνὸν πρόβατον, τὸ προφητευόμενον ἀρνίον, οὗ διὰ τῆς ἐνθέου καὶ μυστικῆς διδασκαλίας πάντες ἡμεῖς οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν προτέρων ἁμαρτημάτων εὑράμεθα, διὸ καὶ Ἰουδαίων οἱ εἰς αὐτὸν ἠλπικότες ἐλεύθεροι τῆς Μωσέως ἀφίενται κατάρας,] εἰκότως τὴν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τὴν ὑπόμνησιν δσημέραι ἐπιτελοῦντες, καὶ τῆς κρείττονος ἢ κατὰ*

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

adds," saith Heylin[u], "that 'Christ our Saviour, offering such a wonderful and excellent sacrifice to His heavenly Father for the salvation of us all, He also appointed us to offer daily *μνήμην*, the commemoration of the same to God, *ἀντὶ τῆς θυσίας*, for, and as, a sacrifice[x].' And anon after he adds, 'that whensoever we celebrate the memory of that sacrifice on the table, partaking of the symbols[y] of His body and blood[z], &c., we should say with David, Thou preparest a table for me in the presence of mine enemies; Thou anointest my head with oil, my cup runneth over. Wherein,' saith he, 'the prophet signifies the mystical unction, *καὶ τὰ σεμνὰ τῆς Χριστοῦ τραπέζης θύματα*, and the reverend sacrifices of Christ's table, where we are taught to offer unto the Lord, by His own most eminent and glorious High-Priest[a], the unbloody, reasonable, and most acceptable sacrifice all our life long[b].'" This is the third passage which Dr. Heylin produces, where I cannot but observe, that Eusebius, according to the tradition of the other fathers, as I have shewn from them, and from the most ancient form of consecration, in the Christian Priesthood[c], asserts, that Christ appointed the sacrifice of His own table, to wit, the symbols of bread and wine, to be offered unto God. Then the Doctor proceeds to the fourth passage in these words: "This he entitleth afterwards 'the sacrifice of praise, the divine, reverend, and most holy sacrifice, the pure sacrifice of the New Testament[d].'" Then

τοὺς παλαιοὺς, θυσίας τε καὶ ἱερουργίας ἠξιωμένοι.—[Euseb., ibid., cap. x. p. 37, A, B.]

[u] ["Hakewill," in the third edition; by mistake; Antid. Line., sect. ii. cap. v. p. 23.]

[x] [*Μετὰ δὴ πάντα οἷόν τι θαυμάσιον θῦμα καὶ σφάγιον ἐξαίρετον τῷ* Πατρὶ *καλλιερησάμενος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁπάντων ἡμῶν ἀνήνεγκε σωτηρίας, μνήμην καὶ ἡμῶν παραδοὺς ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς προσφέρειν.*—Euseb., ibid., p. 38, C.]

[y ["elements." Heylin.]

[z [Rather "having received by tradition that we should celebrate the memory of that Sacrifice . . . by means of the symbols of," &c.]

[a ["and glorious Priest." Heylin.]

[b *Τούτου* [*δῆτα*] *τοῦ θύματος τὴν μνήμην ἐπὶ τραπέζης ἐκτελεῖν διὰ συμβόλων τοῦ τε σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου αἵματος* [*κατὰ θεσμοὺς τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης παρειληφότες, πάλιν ὑπὸ τοῦ προφήτου Δαβὶδ παιδευόμεθα λέγειν, Ἡτοιμάσας ἐνώπιόν μου τράπεζαν, ἐξ ἐναντίας τῶν θλιβόντων με. ἐλίπανας ἐν ἐλαίῳ τὴν κεφαλήν μου, καὶ τὸ ποτήριόν σου μεθύσκον με ὡς κράτιστον* (Ps. xxiii.) *Διαῤῥήδην γοῦν ἐν τούτοις καὶ τὸ μυστικὸν σημαίνεται χρίσμα,*] *καὶ τὰ σεμνὰ τῆς* Χριστοῦ *τραπέζης θύματα,* [*δι' ὧν καλλιεροῦντες, τὰς ἀναίμους καὶ λογικὰς αὐτῷ τε προσηνεῖς θυσίας διὰ παντὸς βίου τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων προσφέρειν Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ πάντων ἀνωτάτου Ἀρχιερέως αὐτοῦ δεδιδάγμεθα.*—Euseb., ibid., p. 39, A, B.]

[c [ch. ii. sect. 10. § 6.]

[d [*Θύομεν δῆτα τοιγαροῦν τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεῷ*] *θυσίαν αἰνέσεως· θύομεν τὸ ἔνθεον καὶ σεμνὸν καὶ ἱεροπρεπὲς θῦμα· θύομεν καινῶς κατὰ τὴν καινὴν διαθήκην τὴν καθαρὰν θυσίαν.*—[Euseb., ibid., p. 40, A.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

he proceeds to the last in these words: "Finally he joins both these together in the conclusion of the book, and therein doth [thus] at full describe the nature of this sacrifice: 'therefore we sacrifice, and offer as it were with incense, the memory of that great sacrifice, celebrating the same according to the mysteries by Him given to us, and giving thanks to Him for our salvation with godly hymns and prayers to the Lord God, as also offering to Him our whole selves, both soul and body, and to His High-Priest, which is the Word[e].'" Here I must observe, that in this last passage *οὐκοῦν καὶ θύομεν, καὶ θυμιῶμεν,* Eusebius alludes to Malachi i. 11: "My Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto My Name, and a pure offering." Which in the second book[f] he applies as a prophetic prediction to the spiritual sacrifice of the Eucharist, as in the Christian Priesthood[g] I have shewed the ancient fathers did, who always understood by the *Mincha purum,* the pure offering, the material unbloody oblation of bread and wine; and by the 'offering of incense,' the spiritual offering of thanksgiving, prayers, and prayers [praises?] with chaste and unpolluted bodies, and minds purged of malicious and all other evil affections, which attended the oblation of the elements. "And these," saith he, "we are taught to believe are more acceptable to God, than a multitude of sacrifices offered with blood, and smoke, and nidor[h]."

Now let us see what Dr. Hakewill saith to all this. "Dr. Heylin[i]," saith he, "foreseeing that what he had alleged did not reach home to his purpose, endeavours to make it up by the addition of this last clause, as if Eusebius made the memory or commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ to be in and of itself a sacrifice; and this he would collect from these words of his *ἀντὶ τῆς*[j] *θυσίας,* which he translates 'for,'

[e] [*Οὐκοῦν καὶ θύομεν, καὶ θυμιῶμεν· τότε μὲν τὴν μνήμην τοῦ μεγάλου θύματος, κατὰ τὰ πρὸς αὐτοῦ παραδοθέντα μυστήρια ἐπιτελοῦντες, καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν εὐχαριστίαν δι' εὐσεβῶν ὕμνων τε καὶ εὐχῶν τῷ Θεῷ προσκομίζοντες· τότε δὲ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ὅλῳ καθιεροῦντες αὐτῷ, καὶ τῷ γε Ἀρχιερεῖ αὐτοῦ Λόγῳ, αὐτῷ σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ ἀνακείμενοι.*—Id. ibid., p. 40, B, C.]

[f] [Id. ibid., lib. ii. cap. xxix. pp. 55, D. 56, A.]

[g] [ch. ii. sect. 10. § 4.]

[h] [*ἀρεστὰ γὰρ αὐτῷ ταῦτα εἶναι μᾶλλον ἢ θυσιῶν πλῆθος, αἵματι καὶ καπνῷ καὶ κνίσσαις ἐπιτελουμένων, πεπαιδεύμεθα.*—Euseb., ibid., lib. i. cap. x. p. 40, C.]

[i] [Diss., p. 25.]

[j] [The article is not in the original; Reynolds reads *ἀντὶ θυσίας.* Bilson does not quote the Greek words; Hey-

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

and 'as' a sacrifice, whereas both Bishop Bilson[k], and Dr. Reynolds[l], and others of our best learned divines, translate it 'instead' of a sacrifice. Now that which is instead of a sacrifice, cannot be indeed, and of itself, properly so called. And besides, how we should be said to offer up our commemoration for a sacrifice, as the Doctor (Heylin) affirmeth, I cannot understand, since commemoration is an action, and being so, it cannot, [as I conceive,] in propriety of speech be the thing sacrificed, which must of necessity be a substance as it stands in opposition to accidents. So that if neither the sanctification of the creature, nor the commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ, nor the offering up of ourselves, or praise and thanksgiving can amount to a sacrifice, properly so called, surely the Doctor hath not yet found it in the fathers, but will be forced to make a new search for the finding of it."

Thus Dr. Hakewill. In reply to which let us observe first, that the Hebrew words זכר, זכרון, and the Chaldee דכרניא, are indifferently rendered in the Septuagint by *μνήμη*, and *μνημόσυνον*, (as also by *ἀνάμνησις*,) *memoria*, and *memoriale*, as it appears in Kircher's Concordance[m], by many examples; and therefore in some places of our Bible, where 'remembrance' is in the text, we have 'memorial' in the margin, as Psalm xcvii. 12. Secondly, we must observe of the preposition *ἀντὶ*, that it signifies first *pro*, 'for,' as *pro* denotes *loco, vice*, 'instead,' of which I need give no examples; secondly it signifies *propter*, and *gratia*, as *gratia* is used in the ablative case; of which, not to bring proofs out of lexicographers, we have one in Heb. xii. 16, "Ὃς *ἀντὶ βρώσεως μιᾶς ἀπέδοτο, κ.τ.λ. Qui propter unam escam vendidit suum jus primogeniti,* "who for one morsel of meat sold his birth-right." So also it signifies Matt. xx. 28, and Mark x. 45, *ἀντὶ πολλῶν, pro multis,* "the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to

lin inserts it, and is followed by Hakewill, apparently without being aware of its having any force.]

[k] [In, The true difference between Christian subjection and unchristian rebellion. Part 4. p. 511. London, 1586.]

[l] [In, The Conference between John Rainoldes and John Hart, touching the Head and the Faith of the Church, cap. viii. div. 4. p. 536. London, 1609.]

[m] [Concordantiæ Vet. Test. Græcæ Ebræis Vocibus respondentes, tom. i. pp. 1307—1309. Francofurti. 1607. זכר is rendered by *μνήμη* and *μνημόσυνον* frequently, but not by *ἀνάμνησις*: זכרון usually by *μνημόσυνον*, but by *μνήμη*, Eccl. i. 11, ii. 11, and by *ἀνάμνησις*, Num. x. 10, (and in Symmachus, Ps. vi. 5.) דכרניא is rendered by *μνημόσυνα*, Ezra iv. 15.]

minister, and to give His soul a ransom for many." And thirdly, with little difference from this second signification, it denotes the end, and signifies *pro*, 'for,' in that sense which the Latins also express by *ut*, or *eo ut*, as in 1 Cor. xi. 15; *Ὅτι ἡ κόμη ἀντὶ περιβολαίου δίδοται αὐτῇ, quoniam capilli pro velamine ei dati sunt*, 'for her hair is given her for a covering,' or veil. Thirdly, we must observe that *τῆς θυσίας*, in the contested passage, *μνήμην καὶ ἡμῖν παραδοὺς ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς προσφέρειν*, may be taken definitely, as it denotes 'the' sacrifice, or indefinitely, as it may signify 'a' sacrifice, as appellatives even with definite articles often signify in the Greek tongue.

These distinctions being premised, I assert first, that *μνήμη* here signifies *μνημόσυνον*, 'a memorial,' viz. the bread and wine, which was offered at the consecration in memory of that *θαυμάσιον θῦμα*, that 'wonderful sacrifice,' which Eusebius in the next preceding words saith Christ offered to His Father for the salvation of mankind, having appointed us to offer up the memorial of the same to God, *ἀντὶ τῆς θυσίας*. This quite enervates Dr. Hakewill's objection, who asked how we could offer up a commemoration for a sacrifice, and declared he could not understand how commemoration, being an action, could be sacrificed, but the Bishop, who vouches the Doctor, may understand how a memorial, which is a substance, or a thing by which a commemoration is made, may be sacrificed; and so much in answer to that formidable objection.

Farther, this expression of Eusebius was apt and apposite for a writer of the Greek Church, where in the form of consecration, after "this is My body," &c. and "this is My blood," &c. "do this in remembrance of Me," &c., it immediately follows, *μεμνημένοι τοίνυν*[n], &c. "We therefore being mindful of (or commemorating) His passion, and death, &c., do offer unto Thee (our) King, and God, this bread, and this cup, according to His institution, *εὐχαριστοῦντες σοὶ*, giving thanks unto Thee through Him, for that Thou hast counted us worthy to stand before Thee, and execute the priestly office, and we beseech Thee, who needest not any thing, to look with com-

[n] Constit. Apost., lib. viii. cap. xii. [Concil., tom. i. p. 481, A, B, C. See the passage cited at length.] Christian Priesthood, ch. ii. sect. 10. § 6.

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

placency upon those gifts now set before Thee." Here we see the commemoration made of the sacrifice of our Lord, that *θαυμάσιον θῦμα*, and *σφάγιον ἐξαίρετον*, by the bread and wine, the symbols of His body and blood, at and in the oblation of them to God the Father. They are the memorials, monuments, and representatives of His dead body, and effused blood; and as it is usual in authors to put one of two concomitants for both, so admitting *μνήμην* to be taken for the action of commemoration, yet it connoting the oblation of the bread and wine in the holy Sacrament, by which the commemoration was made, it was in effect to say, that Christ appointed us daily to offer the *προσφορὰν* or oblation to God, at, in, and by which the commemoration was made. By *μνήμη* therefore Eusebius could not but mean the commemorative oblation, or sacrificial commemoration, made by the bread and wine in the holy Eucharist; for what he believed, with the Catholic Church, Christ had appointed and joined together, he could not design to put asunder. These two, like Castor and Pollux, always formerly appeared at the Christian altars, and were no more to be separated in the Eucharistical service, than in the passover of the Jews the sacrifice of the paschal lamb was to be separated from the solemn commemoration of their deliverance out of Egypt, or that commemoration from the sacrifice of the paschal lamb.

But to proceed: if *τῆς θυσίας* in this passage is to be taken indefinitely, then it must be rendered thus: "After all, Christ offering up in due manner such a wonderful sacrifice and super-excellent victim to His Father, for the salvation of us all, He instituted the memorial [of it] that we should continually offer it to God for a sacrifice." So in the Latin version°: *Itaque post omnia, quasi mirabilem quandam victimam, sacrificiumque eximium patri suo operatus, pro nostra omnium salute obtulit, ejusque rei memoriam ut nos ipsi Deo pro sacrificio offerremus, instituit.* The justness of this translation will appear, if we may suppose that Eusebius, speaking of the same sacrifice of Christ, had in like manner said, *οὗ*

° Μετὰ δὴ πάντα οἷόν τι θαυμάσιον θῦμα, καὶ σφάγιον ἐξαίρετον τῷ πατρὶ καλλιερησάμενος, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁπάντων ἡμῶν ἀνήνεγκε σωτηρίας, μνήμην καὶ ἡμῖν παραδοὺς ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς προσφέρειν. [See note x, p. 10.]

τύπον καὶ Ἰουδαίοις παραδοὺς Μωυσῆς ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ ἐνιαυσίας προσφέρειν, "the type whereof Moses instituted among the Jews, that they should offer it yearly to God for a sacrifice." I desire the Bishop to compare these two ways of speaking together, and then to tell me the difference between μνήμην and τύπον, or whether by the 'type' in the supposed latter expression he would not understand the typical lamb, or thing which was the type, and not take type in the abstract for the figure or shadow, and thence argue like Dr. Hakewill, that a figure or shadow could not be sacrificed, or in propriety of speech be called a sacrifice.

But in case ἀντὶ signified nothing else in the Greek tongue but 'for,' as 'for' signifies 'instead,' yet taking τῆς θυσίας in this passage definitely and demonstratively, for the wonderful sacrifice of Christ mentioned immediately before μνήμην, Dr. Hakewill's objection, viz. "That what is instead of a sacrifice cannot be indeed a sacrifice, or of itself be properly so called," I say, upon this supposition, the Doctor's objection will fall to the ground, because the place then may be rendered thus: "After all, Christ offering up in due manner such a wonderful sacrifice and super-excellent victim to His Father, for the salvation of us all, He instituted the memorial [of it] that we should continually offer it to God instead of the sacrifice," that is, instead of the sacrifice of Christ, of which he spoke in the next preceding words. And that the bread and wine were substituted in place of the body and blood of Christ, and the oblation of them appointed to commemorate, and represent the oblation of Christ upon the cross, in this holy Sacrament, I believe Dr. Hakewill, were he alive to reconsider the subject, would not deny to have been the doctrine of the ancient Catholic Church, nor perhaps will the Bishop deny it now. Of these two senses, in which Eusebius's words may be rendered, I will not determine which was his meaning, or the more probable of the two. But either of them fully answers the cavils of Dr. Hakewill against Heylin, and justifies the latter against him, whose objections and arguments against the sacrifice in the holy Eucharist are all of the same cavilling and trifling sort. Thus he argues against it, because it doth not answer to the nature and definition

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

of a Jewish sacrifice[p], in which "the sensible things sacrificed," were "as to their substance destroyed, and consumed," "things having life being killed, and things without life, if solid were burnt, if liquid poured forth and spilt." Such arguments also are the two following against "the bread and wine's being the subject matter of the Eucharistical sacrifice[q]," because "it would [both] overthrow the unity of the sacrifice, inasmuch as they are both often renewed, and in itself be of less value and dignity than many of the Jewish sacrifices." But what kind of arguing is this? For upon supposition that the bread and wine are the matter of the Eucharistical sacrifice, as they are of the Eucharistical Sacrament, doth not the renewing of them in the ministration of the Eucharist destroy the unity of the one as well as the other? or doth it destroy the unity of the sacrificial or sacramental celebrity and ministration, which, as in public Jewish and Gentile sacrifices, was 'one,' though many sacrifices were offered, not only numerically but specifically distinct? Then as to the 'value' and 'dignity,' if the Doctor means only the market-value and dignity of it, as it is plain he doth, it is an objection not becoming a divine, nor worthy of an answer; but if he means the representative, which may be called the spiritual value, or sacramental dignity of this oblation, I shall hereafter shew that it is of more value and dignity than all the sacrifices of the Jewish Church.

He saith, in "this proposition, the 'Eucharist is a representative sacrifice, properly so called,' that he will easily grant it is properly representative, but improperly a sacrifice," "as he who represents a king is commonly called a king, yet in propriety of speech he cannot be so termed unless he be a king in his own person[r]." To which I must reply, that the ancient Church every where literally and properly offered up the bread and wine to God the Father in the holy Eucharist, and taught that it was an oblation appointed by Christ to represent and commemorate the oblation, or sacrifice, of Himself upon the cross; or that it was a sacrifice representative of that all-atoning, or full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice for

[p] [Dissertation with Heylin, pp. 5, 6.]
[q] [Ibid., pp. 6, 7.]
[r] [Ibid., pp. 8, 9.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

the sins of the world. And as a king, though but a *regulus* or petty king, who represents an Augustus or other king, a thousand times greater than himself, is properly a king, as well as properly a representative; so the Eucharistical sacrifice of bread and wine is properly a sacrifice, as well as properly representative. Upon which account it is not only the most worthy, valuable, and venerable, but the most tremendous sacrifice that ever was offered by man to God. This I have shewed at large in my Discourse of the Christian Priesthood, and Dr. Heylin had sufficiently shewed the same in his Antidotum Lincolniense, which, as it appears from his Appendix to his Examen Historicum[s], Dr. Hakewill may very well be thought to have opposed out of pique.

He saith[t], he "never heard that the Eucharistical sacrifice of Christians was other than spiritual;" but if he did not, he might have heard from the ancient Church writers that there was a material oblation of bread and wine, as well as a spiritual sacrifice of concomitant praise and thanksgiving, in the holy Eucharist, which made them speaking of it, use such phrases as these, *προσφέρομέν σοι*, &c., "We offer up unto Thee this bread and this cup," in the act of consecration. But not to transcribe from what I have already written on this subject[u], let me add some new testimonies, as what is written in Const. Apost., lib. ii. c. 25, where speaking of bishops, he[v] saith[x], "You are ministers in the holy Catholic Church, who stand at the altar of the Lord our God, to offer up unto Him reasonable and unbloody sacrifices, through Jesus Christ the great High-Priest." And afterwards in the same chapter[y]: "What the victims were then,

[s] [Heylin in his History of St. George of Cappadocia, (part i. c. 3. § 6. pp. 52, 53. London, 1631,) had cited Hakewill as agreeing with Reynolds, who maintained the identity of St. George with George the Arian. Hakewill wrote an angry confutation of that book: the arguments of which Heylin answered. Hence Hakewill's animosity against Heylin. See the Examen Historicum, part ii. Appendix, pp. 16, 17. London, 1659.]

[t] [Diss. p. 39.]

[u] [Christian Priesthood, chap. ii. sect. 10; see § 6. i.]

[v] [St. Clement of Rome, the supposed writer of the Apostolical Constitutions.]

[x] [*ὑμεῖς οὖν σήμερον, ὦ ἐπίσκοποι, ἐστε τῷ λαῷ ὑμῶν ἱερεῖς, λευῖται οἱ λειτουργοῦντες τῇ ἱερᾷ σκηνῇ τῇ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ παρεστῶτες τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, καὶ προσάγοντες αὐτῷ τὰς λογικὰς καὶ ἀναιμάκτους θυσίας διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀρχιερέως.*—Const. Apost., lib. ii. c. 25. Concil., tom. i. p. 260, E.]

[y] [*αἱ τότε θυσίαι, νῦν εὐχαὶ, καὶ δεήσεις, καὶ εὐχαριστίαι· αἱ τότε ἀπαρχαὶ, καὶ δεκάται, καὶ ἀφαιρέματα, καὶ δῶρα,*

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

prayers, and supplications, and giving of thanks are now; what first-fruits, and tithes, and separate portions[z], and gifts were then, the oblations are now, which the holy bishops offer unto the Lord God through Jesus Christ, who died for them; for they are your high-priests, and the presbyters your priests." So lib. viii. cap. 28[a]: "The deacon doth not give the blessing, nor baptize, nor offer, but when the bishop or presbyter hath offered, he distributes to the people." So lib. iii. cap. 10[b]: "We do not permit laics any part of the sacerdotal function, as to sacrifice," &c. Here is also that phrase, *εὐχαριστίαν ἀνοῖσαι*[c], "to offer the Eucharist," lib. ii. cap. 58. And in lib. viii. cap. 46: [*Τὴν εἰς τὰς*] *θυσίας, καὶ εὐχαριστίας ἀμέλειαν*·[d] . . . *οὔτε γὰρ διακόνῳ προσφέρειν θυσίαν θεμιτὸν*[e] . . . *μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάληψιν αὐτοῦ* [*Χριστοῦ*] *ἡμεῖς προσενεγκόντες κατὰ τὴν διάταξιν αὐτοῦ θυσίαν καθαρὰν καὶ ἀναίμακτον, προεχειρισάμεθα ἐπισκόπους, κ.τ.λ.*[f] "The contempt of the sacrifice and giving of thanks. It is not lawful for the deacon to offer sacrifice. We (the Apostles) after His assumption, offering a pure and unbloody sacrifice (or oblation)[g] according to His ordinance[h], ordained bishops," &c.

Dr. Hakewill denies *hoc facite* in the institution to have a sacrificial signification, or that *facere* or *sacrificare* there are all one, because "the words of the institution are doubtless directed to all the faithful by St. Paul in the Church of Corinth, and in them to all Christians. So that," saith he, "Dr. Heylin will be forced to prove his sacrificing from eating and drinking, and withal to admit all Christians to do sacrifice, against which he solemnly protests[i]." But that

νῦν προσφοραὶ, αἱ διὰ τῶν ὁσίων ἐπισκόπων προσφερόμεναι Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντος· οὗτοι γάρ εἰσιν ὑμῶν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς ὑμῶν, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι.—Ibid., p. 261, E.]

[z] *ἀφαιρέματα.*

[a] [*διάκονος οὐκ εὐλογεῖ· οὐ δίδωσιν εὐλογίαν· λαμβάνει δὲ παρὰ ἐπισκόπου καὶ πρεσβυτέρου· οὐ βαπτίζει· οὐ προσφέρει· τοῦ δὲ ἐπισκόπου προσενεγκόντος ἢ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου, αὐτὸς ἐπιδίδωσι τῷ λαῷ, οὐχ ὡς ἱερεὺς, ἀλλ' ὡς διακονούμενος ἱερεῦσι.*—Ibid., lib. viii. c. 28. p. 493, C.]

[b] [*οὔτε λαϊκοῖς ἐπιτρέπομεν ποιεῖν τι τῶν ἱερατικῶν ἔργων· οἷον θυσίαν κ.τ.λ.* —Ibid., lib. iii. c. 10. p. 317, C.]

[c] [Ibid., lib. ii. c. 58. p. 300, B.]

[d] [Ibid., lib. viii. c. 46. p. 508, E.]

[e] [Ibid., p. 509, D.]

[f] [Ibid., p. 512, A.]

[g] *Κατὰ τὴν διάταξιν αὐτοῦ*· in cap. xii. *κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ διάταξιν.*—[Ibid., p. 481.]

[h] Clementis ad Cor. Epist. i. § xlii. [*οἱ ἀποστόλοι . . . καθίστασαν τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν . . εἰς ἐπισκόπους.* Patr. Apost., tom. i. p. 171.]

[i] [Hakewill, Diss., p. 17.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

doing of sacrifice by the Christian people, against which he saith the Doctor protests, is doing of it as priests do it, by undertaking the holy ministration thereof, against which the primitive Christian writers remonstrate in great abundance, as a piacular crime and the sin of Korah. But Dr. Heylin could not be so absurd as not to know that the people, both among Jews and Gentiles, joined in their public sacrifices with their priests, by whose hands they offered them upon the altars of their respective gods, and communicated with them of their sacrifices in their sacrificial feasts. *Facere* therefore in the words of the institution, may properly signify to sacrifice in both senses, as the priests and people are both said to sacrifice properly, when these offer by their ministration any material oblation to any God. And thus the Christian people were both concerned in the *hoc facite* of the Eucharistical oblations of bread and wine, which they brought to their liturgs or priests, who out of their oblations took *ἀφαιρέματα*, or holy portions, and, as I have shewed in my preface to my second Collection of Controversial Letters[j] and in the Christian Priesthood[k], solemnly offered them to God the Father, through Jesus Christ, according to His institution. And therefore, as Dr. Heylin asserts[l], '*hoc facite*' in the liturgical sense 'is solely and properly for the priest who only hath power to consecrate.' And to shew the vanity of this cavil against Dr. Heylin, let me observe, that it destroys the power of consecrating, as well as offering, the bread and wine in the Eucharist, because the words of the institution are directed to all the faithful, in which it is not only said "Do ye this," but, "Do ye this in remembrance of Me." "Which doing pertaineth not only to the Apostles" (as he cites the words of Bishop Jewel against Harding[m]) "but to the whole congregation of Corinth;" which is very

[j] [pp. 37—48. Lond. 1710.]

[k] [chap. ii. sect. x. § 4, 5, 6.]

[l] ["There is an *hoc facite* belonging to them, onely, as they are priests under and of the gospell. *Hoc facite* is for the priest, who hath power to consecrate; *hoc edite* is both for priests and people."—Antidot. Linc., sect. ii. c. 5. pp. 7, 8. London. 1637.]

[m] ["He saith not only, 'Do ye this,' but He addeth also, 'in My remembrance:' which doing pertaineth, not only unto the Apostles, and their successors, as M. Harding imagineth, but also to the whole people. And therefore St. Paul saith, not only to the ministers, but also to the whole congregation of Corinth, 'as often, &c.'" Hakewill, Diss., p. 18. Jewell's Reply to Harding, Art. xvii. Dis. 4. p. 415. London, 1609.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

true, but then it must be said, that as the congregation offered, so it consecrated and performed the whole Eucharistical service, by the ministration of the priest, who therefore always administered in the plural number, and particularly in the consecration, when he said, *προσφέρομέν σοι*, "We offer unto thee our King and God, this bread and this cup," &c. But then he saith again, "Should we grant that *hoc facite* were to be referred only to the actions of Christ Himself, and directed only to the Apostles and their successors, yet it must first be proved that Christ Himself in the institution of the Sacrament did offer a sacrifice properly so called, which," saith he, "for any thing that appears in the text, cannot be gathered from any speech which He then uttered, or action which He did, or gesture which He used[n]."

To which I answer, first, that in my Discourse of the Christian Priesthood I think I have fully proved, not only from the consentient tradition of the Catholic Church both in doctrine and practice, but from many texts of Scripture as understood by the best Christian writers, that the Eucharist is a proper sacrifice, and if that be as sufficiently proved as many other Christian doctrines which have no other or better proof, then it must follow that it was a proper sacrifice from the very institution, in which Christ offered up the bread and cup to His Father in the consecration, as I have shewed the ancient Church did. This is a demonstration *a posteriori*, as the schools speak. But then in the second place, I have in the same discourse shewed from the testimony of the best Church writers, that our blessed Lord did offer up the bread and cup at the institution of this holy Sacrament, as is also taught in Const. Apost., lib. viii. cap. 46, in the following words[o]; *πρῶτος τοίνυν τῇ φύσει ἀρχιερεὺς, κ. τ. λ.* "Wherefore Christ the only begotten (Son,) who was the first High-Priest by nature[p], did not take this honour of the priest-

[n] [Hakewill, Diss., p. 20.]

[o] [*πρῶτος τοίνυν τῇ φύσει ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ μονογενὴς Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τὴν τιμὴν ἁρπάσας, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς κατασταθείς· ὃς γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος δι' ἡμᾶς, καὶ τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν προσφέρων τῷ Θεῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ πατρὶ πρὸ τοῦ πάθους, ἡμῖν διετάξατο μόνοις τοῦτο ποιεῖν· μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάληψιν ἡμεῖς προσενεγκόντες κατὰ τὴν διάταξιν αὐτοῦ θυσίαν καθαρὰν καὶ ἀναίμακτον, κ. τ. λ.* pp. 509, E. 511, A.]

[p] See Cotelerius' note upon the place. ["Homines gratia Dei et adoptione pontifices fiunt, Christus autem vocari potest natura pontifex, hoc est, proprietate ac auctoritate, juxta illud Tertulliani iv. adversus Marcionem 35.

hood to Himself, but was made a Priest by the Father, and being made man for us, and offering a spiritual sacrifice to His God and Father, commanded us also [alone?] to do (or offer) the same; and after His assumption, we offering a pure and unbloody sacrifice, according to His command," &c., as in this passage above cited[q]. And it is not to be imagined, that in the consecration of the elements the Christian priests of the ancient Church should tell God the Father, that they offered them unto Him through Jesus Christ, according to His ordinance, unless they believed that He offered them Himself in the institution of this blessed Sacrament. But thirdly, it is not true, that there is no speech or action in the text of the institution, from whence it may be gathered that He offered the bread and cup, and by consequence a sacrifice properly so called, unto His Father. For I have shewed at large that *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*, "do this," is a sacrificial phrase; and so *λαβὼν* or *ἔλαβε τὸν ἄρτον*, "He took bread," is a sacrificial speech and imports a sacrificial action, as in Gen. xxii. 13, it is said of Abraham, *καὶ ἔλαβε τὸν κριὸν*, "that he took the ram, and offered him for a burnt-offering;" so Levit. iv. 30, *καὶ λήψεται ὁ ἱερεὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος*, "and the priest shall take of the blood thereof with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar;" so ver. 34, *καὶ λαβὼν ὁ ἱερεὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος*, "and the priest shall take of the blood of the sin-offering with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the

'authenticus pontifex Dei patris.' [Opp. p. 451, D.] et lib. v. cap. 9. 'Christus proprius et legitimus Dei Antistes.' [p. 472, C.] Non quidem per divinitatem, proprie loquendo: quod Arianice ab Eusebio [Dem. Evang., lib. v. cap. iii. p. 223.] post Origenem asseritur, Catholice negatur ab auctore [incerto quodam, post quintum sæculum. edd. Ben. p. 402.] Sermonis de uno legislatore, tom. vi. B. Chrysostomi: sed per carnem, ut ait idem scriptor. [S. Chrys. opp., tom. vi. p. 412, A, B.] secutus S. Athanasium in majore Oratione de fide apud Theodoritum, Dialogo 2. [op., tom. iv. p. 92.] Dixi proprie loquendo: quia latius acceptum nomen pontificis, Verbo Dei non impie tribuetur, et Christo nondum incarnato, ut charismatum paternorum, donorum Dei universali distributori. 'Catholicum Patris Sacerdotem' appellat Tertullianus lib. iv. citati operis cap. ix. [p. 420, B.] Certe Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus in Catechesi 10. [§ 14. p. 144, A.] Christi Sacerdotium vult esse æternum absque initio ac fine. ['De Sempiterno ejusdem (Christi) sacerdotio fuit eadem veterum nonnullorum opinio; sub quarti seculi finem vel quinti medium jam communi Theologorum consensu explosa.' not. edd. Ben. ibid., p. 143, E, F.] In Anastasii Collectaneis, p. 123. [Bibl. Vet. Patrum, tom. xiii. p. 53, D.] 'Unius natura regis cunctorum Dei, natura etiam ob salutem nostram pontificis facti, unus erat typus Melchisedech.' [*ἑνὸς τοῦ φύσει βασιλέως Θεοῦ τῶν ὅλων γενομένου φύσει διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἀρχιερέως εἷς ὑπῆρχε τύπος ὁ Μελχισεδέκ.*]—Cotelerii annott. ad locum. Patr. Apost., tom. i. p. 427.]

[q] [p. 18. f, lib. viii. c. 46. p. 512, A.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

altar." And so our Saviour may be supposed to have taken bread from, or of, or out of, the portion of bread upon the table, to offer it unto His Father in blessing it or giving thanks; and since the words will fairly bear this sacrificial sense, and the ancient Church understood the text in the same sense, that He took the bread and cup and offered them up to His Father, it is a sufficient proof that He offered a sacrifice properly so called, and that it was for want of thorough conversation with the ancient fathers in their writings, or rather great pique and prejudice against Dr. Heylin, that occasioned Dr. Hakewill to assert, that there was no speech which our Saviour uttered, nor any action that He did, from whence it might be gathered that He offered a sacrifice in the holy Eucharist properly so called.

But he saith, that which confirms him in his opinion that the Eucharist is not a proper sacrifice, is that both Lombard[r], and Aquinas, who termed the Eucharist a commemorative, yet held it to be an improper sacrifice[s]; Lombard's sentences I have not by me, and therefore shall only consider the words he produces out of Aquinas[t], which are these: *Quæritur, si quod gerit sacerdos proprie dicatur sacrificium, vel immolatio, et si Christus quotidie immoletur, vel semel tantum immolatus sit?* To which he answers, *Illud, quod offertur et consecratur a sacerdote vocari sacrificium et oblationem, quia memoria est et repræsentatio veri sacrificii, et sanctæ immolationis factæ in ara crucis.* Here the question Thomas proposes is, whether the bread and wine, *quod gerit sacerdos,* or

[r] [His words are, "Ad hoc breviter dici potest, illud quod offertur et consecratur a sacerdote vocari sacrificium et oblationem: quia memoria est et repræsentatio veri sacrificii et sanctæ immolationis factæ in ara crucis."—P. Lombardi Sentent., lib. iv. dist. 12. § 7. p. 745. Moguntiæ. 1632.]

[s] [Diss., p. 10.]

[t] ["With Lombard doth Aquinas herein likewise accord, Part iii. Quæst. 73. Art. 4. in conclusione. 'Eucharistiæ Sacramentum ut est dominicæ passionis commemorativum, Sacrificium nominatur.' Where it is observable that he saith not 'sacrificium est,' but only 'nominatur,' and what his meaning therein was, appears of that article [3.] which is this: 'Hostia videtur esse idem quod sacrificium. Sicut ergo non proprie dicitur sacrificium, ita nec proprie dicitur hostia.' Which though it be an objection, yet he takes it as granted that it is 'sacrificium improprie dictum,' at leastwise as it is 'commemorativum' or 'repræsentativum;' and therefore to that objection doth he shape this answer, 'Ad tertium dicendum, quod hoc Sacramentum dicitur Sacrificium, in quantum repræsentat ipsam passionem Christi. Dicitur autem hostia, in quantum continet ipsum Christum, qui est hostia salutaris: (ut dicitur Ephes. v. 2.)'" (S. Thom. Summa Theologiæ, par. iii. quæst. 73. art. 4. p. 161. Duaci, 1614.) Diss. ibid.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

illud quod offertur et consecratur, may be properly called a sacrifice, as sacrifice signifies *immolatio,* a sacrifice by blood and slaughter, as that of Christ was upon the cross; and by consequence, whether Christ is daily thus sacrificed in the Eucharist, or once only upon the cross? To which he answers, *illud quod offertur, et consecratur,* the bread and wine, which are offered and consecrated, are called a sacrifice, in this sense of immolation, because they are the commemoration and representation of the true sacrifice and holy immolation of Christ made upon the altar of the cross. Here therefore the question is not, whether there is a proper, external, material oblation of bread and wine in the Eucharist; for that Aquinas supposes by those words, *istud quod gerit sacerdos,* and *istud quod offertur et consecratur,* but whether that oblation be a sacrifice, as sacrifice signifies immolation, and whether Christ is so sacrificed in the Eucharist as He was upon the cross. But in this sense none of our writers take it for a real, true, or proper, but only for a mystical and spiritual sacrifice and immolation of Christ upon the cross, as it is a solemn commemoration and representation thereof. The word therefore 'proper,' in relation to the holy Sacrament, hath two senses: one, as 'proper' is opposed to metaphorical and allusive; and the other, as it is opposed to the immolation or bloody sacrifice of Christ upon the cross; which two senses our adversaries always confound together. When therefore we assert the Eucharist to be a 'proper' sacrifice or oblation, we take the word purely in the first sense, meaning no more thereby, than that the bread and cup, like other material and external sacrifices, are really offered unto God in the Eucharistical service, to be the sacramental representation and commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, or the mystical sacrifice of His body and blood. These two different senses of the word 'proper' are also more carefully to be observed, because many of our writers, who believe the Eucharist to be a 'proper' oblation in the first sense, yet often speak of it, without premising any distinction, as an 'improper' sacrifice, only meaning in the second, as Aquinas doth in the passage now examined. And to shew Dr. Hakewill's error more abundantly, I will here demonstrate from other passages, in quæst. 83.

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

art. 4[u], that he believed the holy Sacrament to be a proper sacrifice in the first sense: *Sic igitur populo præparato et instructo, consequenter acceditur ad celebrationem mysterii, quod quidem offertur ut sacrificium, et consecratur, et sumitur ut sacramentum . . . Deinde sacerdos secreto commemorat primo quidem pro quibus hoc sacrificium offertur, scilicet pro universali Ecclesia. . . . . Tertio, petitionem concludit cum dicit, ut hæc oblatio sit illis pro quibus offertur salutaris. Deinde accedit ad ipsam consecrationem in qua . . . quarto, petit hoc sacrificium peractum, esse acceptum Deo. . . Quinto petit hujus sacrificii et sacramenti effectum.*

The reader may perceive from these observations I have made, in answer to Dr. Hakewill's Dissertation, that Dr. Heylin had reason to write of it, as in the margin[v], and I have been induced to examine it so particularly, not only for the sake of the bishop of Norwich, but of some others, who, as I am told, said they wondered I would write for the Eucharistical sacrifice, if I had read that dissertation. I must therefore add in behalf of myself, and all others of the Church of England who have written to prove the Eucharist to be a sacrifice, that we have written nothing in the main of our own fancies, or from the particular notions of two or three fathers; but from the general doctrine of them all, and the practice of all the Christian world, in primitive as well as later times, before the Reformation. "The opinions and usages we maintain" are not "particular" but catholic

[u] [The subject of Quæst. lxxxiii. Art. 4, is "Utrum convenienter ordinentur ea quæ circa hoc sacramentum dicuntur." The passages in the text are taken from a short account of what is said and done in the Latin service, and the question determined affirmatively. —Ibid., p. 192. col. 2.]

[v] Appendix to the advertisements on Mr. Sanderson's History, at the end of Dr. Heylin's Examen Historicum, [in answer to some passages in a scurrilous pamphlet called A Post-haste Reply.] "At such time as the respondent [Heylin] was under the displeasure of the House of Commons, on the complaint of Mr. Prynne, [which was about the beginning of the late long Parliament,] he published a discourse against him in answer to some passages in the book entitled Antidotum Lincolniense, &c., which he entitled by the name of 'A Dissertation with Dr. Heylin whether the Eucharist be a sacrifice properly so termed, &c.,' one of which books being brought to the respondent, as soon as it was come from the press, he found it no such knotty piece, but that it might have been easily cleft asunder without wedge or beetle, and had returned an answer to it, if some of Dr. Hakewill's friends, seeing how weakly it was penned, and how unseasonably it was published, had not took order to suppress it; and they suppressed it with such care and friendly diligence, that within three or four days after the first coming of it out, there was not a book of them to be had for love or money."—[Part ii. Appendix, p. 18. London, 1659.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

and general; neither have we "engaged ourselves to maintain them" out of "party," but for the love of truth; much less are they our "fancies," but real notions verified by doctrine and practice, which we have not "set up for Shibboleths to distinguish ourselves[w]," but with the most noble and charitable and rewardable design of restoring the holy Sacrament to its complete and adequate notion and ministration, as it was taught, and practised in the primitive Church. Now as to the other reflections of this author, upon this doctrine, and the maintainers of it, they are silly, false, and spiteful; first silly, in ascribing the divisions of the Church to them, whereas if the doctrine of the Eucharistical sacrifice be the truth, the primitive truth, then the divisions of the Church are to be charged upon those who will not embrace, but oppose this truth; for truth can never be the true, but only the accidental cause, or mere occasion of divisions, for which they are answerable to God and man, that oppose truth. Another may after the Doctor's example ascribe the divisions of the Church to the maintaining of episcopacy, which hath accidentally occasioned more and more violent divisions, than the doctrine of the Eucharistical sacrifice; and therefore it was, in the second place, both false and spiteful to ascribe "the miseries of the civil war" (which he might have called a rebellion) "not to the separatists, and sectaries, ... but to the quarrels and differences of the Church of England men themselves;" that is, as his meaning must be interpreted, to that part of them, who wrote for the Christian sacrifice, and it may be for other high doctrines, as episcopacy, and non-resistance, which have also caused, that is, accidentally caused, many divisions in the Church, and the miseries consequent thereupon. But to confirm his unjust reflections, he asserts, contrary to all history, that "the separatists and sectaries were brooded after the civil war in Cromwell's army." But were there no Brownists, no

[w] Dr. Nicholls' Preface to his [Comment on the] Common Prayer-Book. [The passage referred to above is this, "I know it has been the practice of several persons, to extend some expressions of it (the Book of Common Prayer) to an unusual meaning; thereby to countenance some particular opinions and usages, which they have engaged themselves to maintain. . . . . Party is a thing which is mighty full of fancy: and, since men have gotten into their heads a notion of two Churches of England, they are setting up different meanings of our Common Prayer Book, and different Shibboleths to distinguish themselves by in performing its service."—p. 13. London, 1710.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

anabaptists, no puritan factions, no presbyterians before the civil war? Nor did Junius Brutus, Martin Marprelate, and innumerable other libels mentioned in historians, and cited by Bishop Bancroft[x] and others, contribute nothing to the kindling of it? Nor were there then no false Churchmen, who helped to begin it, and pull down the monarchy and Church. Oh! how do we want another Heylin to chastise and expose the false historians and misrepresenters of the former reigns! But particularly, as to us who maintain, that the Church always offered the creatures of bread and wine in the holy Sacrament, Mr. Baxter, who began to read the ancient fathers in his old age, as Cato learned Greek, will teach the Doctor more candour, justice, and moderation towards us; and to him I refer him in the Appendix, No. 7. and to his Christian Directory, p. 882[y]. I am confident, were he now alive[z], he would not so severely and unjustly censure us, as the Doctor doth; nor would suggest as if we wrote with an evil intention to introduce the popish sacrifice of the mass, as some others[a] lately have done, against all reason and charity: first, because, as Dr. Hakewill[b] truly observes, "the commemoration or representation of a thing must be both in nature and propriety of speech distinct from the thing it commemorates or represents;" and, secondly, because most of the writers for the Eucharistical sacrifice have also been most eminent writers against the Church of Rome, in defence of the Church of England, from Bishop

[x] [In his "Dangerous positions and proceedings, published and practised within this Island of Britain, under pretence of Reformation, and for the Presbyteriall Discipline." Book ii. c. 4—13. London, 1593. Reprinted 1640. See also Strype's Whitgift, vol. i. p. 549. Oxford, 1822.]

[y] ["Quest. 122. May the name priests, sacrifice, and altar be lawfully now used instead of Christ's ministers, worship, and the holy table?

Ans. 7. In a word, as no Christian must use these or any words, to false ends or senses, or deceiving purposes, nor yet to scandal; so out of these cases, the words are lawful. And as the fathers are not to be any further condemned for using them, than as the words (which they foresaw not) have given advantage to the Papists to bring in an ill sense and doctrine; so those that now live in Churches and countrys, where the public professed doctrine doth free them from the suspicion of a popish ill sense, should not be judged nor quarrelled with for the terms: but all sober Christians should allow each other the liberty of such phrases, without censoriousness or breach of charity or peace."—Cases of Conscience about matters Ecclesiastical. Part iii. London, 1637.]

[z] [He died on the 8th of December, 1691. Calamy's abridgement of Baxter's History of his Life and Times, vol. i. chap. xv. p. 403. London, 1713.]

[a] [Dr. Hancock in his Answer, &c. see p. 2. note g.]

[b] Dissertation, p. 9.

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

Andrewes, Mr. Mede, Archbishop Laud, &c., to the writers of this present time. These scandalous reflections are much fitter for such a charge as that of the Scottish commissioners against Archbishop Laud[c]; and those who make them, write so like them, that one might think they copied from their original, though I verily believe not with the same design.

I am sorry I have another occasion given me by the bishop of Norwich from concluding, by what he hath said of Mr. Thorndike, than whom none hath written more elaborately to prove, that the Eucharist is an external sacrifice of bread and wine to God, in which the people communicated with the priest, as in peace-offerings. But then for fear he should be misunderstood, as if he thought it to be the real proper propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, which as a Sacrament it only represents, he declares[d], that it is the sacrifice of Christ only mystically, or sacramentally, as appears from his own words: "Now that, in the sense of the Catholic Church, the Sacrament of the Eucharist is a sacrifice propitiatory for the Church, and impetratory of the necessities thereof, in regard of those prayers wherewith it is offered and presented to God, in virtue of the sacrifice of the cross, which it is mystically, (that is representeth and commemorateth,) [a few words will serve to persuade him that knows the practice and custom of the Church in all ages."] So in p. 39: "Now this will first infer, that it is bread and wine which our Lord feeds us with in the Eucharist; and again, that it hath the virtue of sustaining us, by being made the body and blood of Christ, as in a Sacrament, by virtue of the consecration passed upon it; which is all that which I say to a hair, that by being made a Sacrament, it becomes the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, to be feasted upon by Christians." So more plainly p. 40: "It is not [nor can be]

[c] ["The corporal presence of Christ's body in the Sacrament is also to be found here, (the Book of Common Prayer for the use of the Church of Scotland, 1637): for the words of the Mass-book serving to this purpose, which are sharply censured by Bucer in King Edward's Liturgy, and are not to be found in the book of England, are taken in here; Almighty God is incalled, that of his Almighty goodness he may vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with His Word and Spirit, these gifts of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of Christ."—The charge of the Scottish Commissioners against Canterbury and the Lieutenant of Ireland, pp. 13, 14. London, 1641.]

[d] Epilogue [to the Tragedy of the Church of England, book iii. chap. 5.] p. 50. [London, 1659.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

any disparagement to the sacrifice of [our Lord] Christ upon the cross, ... that the Eucharist should be counted the sacrifice of Christ crucified, mystically, and, as in a Sacrament, [represented to, and feasted upon by His people."] It is in this sense only, that Mr. Thorndike, to avoid the imputation of being for the popish sacrifice, asserts the Eucharistical oblation not to be the real but mystical sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, which it represents; and for this he observes, that when the fathers 'call the Eucharist by the name of a sacrifice, and the celebration thereof the death and passion of Christ,' their meaning is not literal, or to be taken in 'property of the words,' but figuratively or with 'abatement' from the literal meaning of them, as, saith he, is evident from the addition of other words, which they use, as 'reasonable,' 'unbloody,' 'commemorative,' 'symbolical,' 'sign,' 'image[e].' Thus also, as the bishop of Norwich observes[f], he applies the words of St. Chrysostom[g] out of his seventeenth homily on the epistle to the Hebrews; where after he had said[h], "'He is our High-Priest who offered the sacrifice that cleanseth us. The same we also offer, which then was offered, that unconsumable sacrifice[i]. This is done in remembrance of that which was then done; for Do this, saith He, in remembrance of Me. We make not another sacrifice as the high-priest then did, but we offer always the same;'" then he adds, "'or rather the remembrance of a sacrifice.'" This indeed is 'an abatement,' to shew that the Eucharist in the consecration was not properly speaking offered by the Church as the real, but only as the symbolical, mystical, and sacramental sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, which it did set forth and repre-

[e] ["And though the fathers divers times call the celebrating of the Eucharist the death and passion of our Lord, which it commemorates, and the sacrifice of His cross; . . . . yet the addition of words which they use, of 'reasonable' and 'unbloody,' of 'commemorative,' of 'symbolical,' of 'sign' and 'image,' are necessary evidences of an abatement on the property of the words, according to their meaning."—Ibid., p. 49.]

[f] [Visit. Charge, pp. 16, 17.]

[g] [Epilogue, book iii. c. 5. p. 50.]

[h] [*ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἡμῶν ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ τὴν θυσίαν τὴν καθαίρουσαν ἡμᾶς προσενεγκών· ἐκείνην προσφέρομεν καὶ νῦν, τὴν τότε τε προσενεχθεῖσαν, τὴν ἀνάλωτον. τοῦτο εἰς ἀνάμνησιν γίνεται τοῦ τότε γενομένου. τοῦτο γὰρ ποιεῖτέ, φησιν, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν· οὐκ ἄλλην θυσίαν, καθάπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τότε, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀεὶ ποιοῦμεν· μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.*—S. Chrys., in Epist. ad Hebr., Hom. xvii. tom. xii. p. 169, A.]

[i] [Thorndike's words are, "that was then offered, that is invincible;" and below, "we make no other sacrifices . . . . but the same always."]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

sent. But then it doth not at all relate to the proper external oblation of bread and wine, to be made by consecration the mystical body and blood of Christ, of which none of the ancients is more full and express than St. Chrysostom, as I have shewed in the Christian Priesthood, nor none of the modern more clear for it than Mr. Thorndike, as I have shewed in the Prefatory Answer to the Book of the Rights; and as his lordship may also see in his book of Religious Assemblies[k], though he hath been so unfortunate, as by mistake to represent both their meanings, and in his mistake almost to triumph in the following words: "One such expression in any father," as this of St. Chrysostom, "where he speaks accurately as correcting his own words, is more to hinder the Eucharist from being a proper sacrifice, than a thousand expressions unguarded and at large can be to make it one[l]." Indeed one such expression relating to the oblation of the elements in the Eucharist, that oblation is figuratively called, and not as the sacrifice of Christ, might be an argument to prove it not to be a proper sacrifice; but in this sense there are no such abating expressions from the sacrificial notion of the Eucharistical oblation, in any of the fathers: but as a king or a peer, who represents another king or peer, is himself a proper king or peer, but improperly the king or peer he represents; so the oblation of the elements in the Eucharist is a proper sacrifice, and properly so called, though it is only the mystical, and by consequence the improper sacrifice of that which it represents; for, as Mr. Thorndike observes, 'as the sacrifices of the old law were nevertheless sacrifices, though they were figures and types of the one sacrifice of the cross; so is the sacrifice of the New Testament nevertheless a proper sacrifice of bread and wine, though it sets forth and represents the same sacrifice, of which the legal sacrifices were types[m].' Wherefore as to be a type did not destroy the proper nature and notion of a legal sacrifice, so neither doth

[k] [Chap. x. pp. 353—370, and p. 379. Camb. 1642.]

[l] [Visit. Charge, p. 17.]

[m] Epilogue, book iii. cap. v. p. 40. [Thorndike's words are, "The sacrifices of the old law ceased not to be sacrifices, because they were figures and prophecies of that one sacrifice upon the cross, ... and why should the commemoration and representation . . . of that one sacrifice of Christ upon the cross . . . be less properly a sacrifice, in dependance upon and denomination from that one."]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

it destroy the proper nature and notion of the evangelical to be a representation; to typify and adumbrate was consistent with the proper idea of the one, and so to represent and commemorate is consistent with the true and proper idea and conception of the other, what a dust soever its adversaries may raise to darken and obscure the ancient and easy notion thereof. It hath the honour, above all the sacrifices that ever were, to be the representative of the sacrifice of the cross; and the value and dignity of it, above all other sacrifices, consists in being the representative of that propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. It was instituted by our Lord for that noble and adorable purpose, and therefore, were I to define the Eucharistical sacrifice, it should be in these forms; the Eucharistical sacrifice is an oblation of bread and wine, instituted by Jesus Christ to represent and commemorate His sacrifice upon the cross. Wherefore to represent and commemorate the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, being the great end of its institution, and the special part of its definition, by which it differs from, and is dignified above, all other sacrifices; it may be said of it in this respect, "We offer a sacrifice, or rather the remembrance of a sacrifice;" without meaning that it is not a proper sacrifice, but only intending to set forth its supereminent dignity above all other sacrifices, in being instituted for a remembrance of the sacrifice of Christ. So speaking of an anniversary festival instituted in remembrance of any great deliverance, we may say, without meaning that it is not a proper festival, 'we keep a feast, or rather the remembrance of such a deliverance.' Such like expressions on such occasions, are not to be construed as spoken 'by way of correction' of what was said before, as his lordship saith, but as spoken to express the great and noble ends for which solemnities were instituted, and for which they are observed, and by which they are distinguished from all other solemnities of the same kind. They are exegetical expressions, and of emphasis, not of correction; and therefore, wherever they are used, it must be considered in which of the two senses the author uses them, and whether or no they hinder the thing spoken of before to be properly what it is called.

I could not pass over his lordship's argument against the

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION

Eucharistical sacrifice from these words of St. Chrysostom, without an answer; and therefore I conclude it with saying, that they are so far from hindering the Eucharist from being a proper sacrifice, that they do not hinder the following passages of that father from proving it to be such: *ἡ προσφορὰ ἡ αὐτή ἐστι, κ. τ. λ.*[n] "The oblation is the same, whosoever offers it: be it Paul, or be it Peter, it is the same which Christ gave to His disciples, and which the priests now offer (*καὶ ἣν νῦν οἱ ἱερεῖς ποιοῦσιν*); for this is not inferior to that, because they are not men who consecrate this, but He," that is Christ, "who consecrated that. For as the words which Christ (*ὁ Θεὸς*) spoke then are the very same which the priest speaks now, so is the oblation the same." So in his homily, *De proditione Judæ*[o], "saith the priest, This is My body; which words change the gifts set before God. (*τὰ προκείμενα.*)" I humbly entreat his lordship to consider that phrase in the first passage, "because they are not men who consecrate this, but Christ who consecrated that," and then to tell me, whether he used that expression as a correction of what he had said before, and so hinder our consecration from being a proper consecration; or whether he spoke only emphatically to instruct the people, that Christ was the principal consecrator of the elements by our hands, and we only the instrumental, subordinate, and ministerial consecrators of them under Him, and by His authority?

I have been necessitated to write all this upon mentioning the additions which I have made in this edition of my book, to what I had said in the former of the Eucharistical sacrifice; but now I have done for ever with that subject, and with all others that will require such labour and study, as through age and infirmities I am no longer able to endure[p]. If it

[n] Hom. ii. in 2 Tim. cap. i. [§ 4. *ἡ προσφορὰ ἡ αὐτή ἐστι, κἂν ὁ τυχὼν προσενέγκῃ· κἂν Παῦλος, κἂν Πέτρος, ἡ αὐτή ἐστιν, ἣν ὁ Χριστὸς τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἔδωκε, καὶ ἣν νῦν οἱ ἱερεῖς ποιοῦσιν· οὐδὲν αὕτη ἐλάττων ἐκείνης, ὅτι καὶ ταύτην οὐκ ἄνθρωποι ἁγιάζουσιν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ καὶ ἐκείνην ἁγιάσας· ὥσπερ γὰρ τὰ ῥήματα, ἅπερ ὁ Θεὸς ἐφθέγξατο, τὰ αὐτά ἐστιν ἅπερ ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ νῦν λέγει, οὕτω καὶ ἡ προσφορὰ ἡ αὐτή ἐστι· καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὅπερ ἔδωκεν.*—tom. xi. p. 671, E.]

[o] [*οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν ὁ ποιῶν τὰ προκείμενα γένεσθαι σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ· ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ σταυρωθεὶς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Χριστός· σχῆμα πληρῶν ἕστηκεν ὁ ἱερεύς, τὰ ῥήματα φθεγγόμενος ἐκεῖνα· ἡ δὲ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστι· τοῦτό μου ἐστι τὸ σῶμά, φησι,* (sc. *ὁ ἱερεὺς*) *τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα μεταῤῥυθμίζει τὰ προκείμενα.*—Hom. i. § 6. tom. ii. p. 384, B. and Hom. ii. § 6. p. 394, B.]

[p] [Hickes was now nearly 70 years old: he was born in 1642. For some years before his death in 1715, he was

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

meets with any more opposition, I leave the farther defence of it to those learned younger divines, or students of divinity, who are conversant in the ancient writers of the Church. God of His mercy to it increase the number of them, and thereby supply the great loss of the late Mr. John Hughes, fellow of Jesus college in Cambridge, whose untimely death (if any thing may be so called which God appoints) I can never mention without grief, and scarce with dry eyes[q].

As for the additions I have made in my discourse of the Dignity of the Episcopal office, I need not tell what, and where they are. They are intermixed with the rest; and I have nothing more to say of them, but to desire the learned reader to observe how many testimonies there are in it for the Eucharistical sacrifice, and the sacerdotal power of forgiving sins, as well as for the distinction of the Church from the State, and the independence of that upon this; of which the bishop saith, "all of them, I am persuaded, erroneous in the manner they have been urged, and no way agreeable to the doctrine of the Church of England[r]." He also insinuates that "the chief promoters of these opinions" are "of the late separation[s]," which is his lordship's mistake, as he may see in the Prefatory Discourse, and in the Appendix, No. 7, and therefore it was not with too much candour or justice that he was pleased to say, "he hoped they should not easily

exceedingly afflicted by the stone, under which his naturally strong constitution was now sinking. He had been obliged to employ friends in writing on subjects, the materials for which he had himself prepared.—Gen. Dict.]

[q] [John Hughes was born 1682; he was in holy orders, and is said to have combined a primitive severity with great suavity and gentleness of disposition; he was on terms of intimate friendship with Ambrose Bonwicke the elder. He was called by Bishop Atterbury "a learned hand." Two interesting letters of his to Mr. Bonwicke, are printed in the Gentleman's Magazine, vol. 48. pp. 583, 622, one detailing a very remarkable narrative of an apparition; the other, dated Aug. 14, 1707, speaking of the edition of S. Chrys. *de Sacerdotio*, which he was then undertaking. The edition came out in 1710. He died Nov. 18. of that year, and was buried in Deptford church, where there is a long inscription to his memory.—See Lysons' Environs of London, vol. iv. p. 367.]

[r] [Visit. Charge, p. 5. "all which, I am persuaded, are," &c.]

[s] [Ibid. The latter subject had been specially treated of by Leslie in The case of the Regale and Pontificate stated, in a discourse concerning the independency of the Church upon any power on earth, in the exercise of her purely spiritual power and authority. London, 1702. Theological Works, vol. i. p. 582. 1721; by Collier, in A brief essay concerning the independency of Church power, 4to. 1692, without name of author or place of publication; by Dodwell, in The doctrine of the Church of England concerning the independency of the clergy on the lay power, as to those rights of theirs which are purely spiritual. 4to. London. 1697.]

let us make more divisions among them, nor be forward to entertain what we urge," (as his phrase is,) "purely because it seems to magnify our office[t]."

I think myself to have a particular share in the honour of this reflection, for which I have given no just cause. And therefore to shew his lordship that what he hath said of two of those three doctrines, and the honour and dignity of the sacerdotal office, which he thinks I magnify too much, is not right and just, I have added several tracts to the Appendix, which will justify me against his lordship's reflections, by shewing that I have spoken soberly, and not above measure, of the Church's independency of the State, and the dignity of the priesthood, and that I have not delivered any other doctrines on that subject than learned men before me have done, in as high if not in higher terms. Two of these tracts are of the Church's independency, whereof one is a preface of Du Pin[u] before a dissertation, in which he shews that the Church hath no authority, direct or indirect, to depose kings, or discharge their subjects from their allegiance. The other is a tract of Isaac Casaubon, *De Libertate Ecclesiastica*, translated by the same learned hand into English, which translated the answer to M. de Fontenelle's History of Oracles, and the continuation of it in answer to Le Clerc[x], [viz. the Rev. Mr. Hilkiah Bedford, A.M.[y]]

[t] ["I hope we shall not easily let them make divisions amongst us, nor be forward to entertain what they urge, purely because it seems to magnify our office, before we have thoroughly considered it."—Ibid., pp. 5, 6.]

[u] [Præloquium before the 7th Dissertation of his work "De Antiqua Ecclesiæ Disciplina." Paris. 1686.] Appendix, No. 5.

[x] [An Answer to M. de Fontenelle's History of Oracles, translated from the French by a priest of the Church of England. London, 1709. A Continuation of the Answer to the History of Oracles, translated from the French. London, 1710. Fontenelle, following Van Dale, attempted to shew, 1. that oracles were not delivered by devils; 2. that they did not cease at the birth of Christ. About twenty years after, (in 1707,) Baltus, the Jesuit, wrote his "Answer" to confute these two positions. Le Clerc having inserted a review of this work in his Bibliothéque Choisèe, Baltus wrote his "Continuation" in answer to it, in 1708.]

[y] [The words in brackets are from the MS. additions in Dr. Hickes' copy. Hilkiah Bedford, formerly a fellow of St. John's college, Cambridge, had been deprived of the preferment he held in the Church of England at the Revolution. He now lived in Westminster and kept a boarding-house for the scholars. He was intimately connected with Hickes, who left all his papers and publications to his care, in a codicil to his will, dated July, 1715. "I give all my manuscripts, letters, and written papers, relating to any controversies I have been engaged in, unto Mr. Hilkiah Bedford, with liberty to him to publish in part, or in whole, such of them as he shall think fit."

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

This treatise never came to my knowledge till it was lately published with the author's epistles in Holland[z]. And both in this and the other treatise, the bishop will find some high things on the argument, which I declined to say lest I should give offence. In particular it must be observed of Isaac Casaubon, that he could not have any temptation to write on purpose "purely to magnify the priestly office," or transgress the "proper bounds" of his subject, or say any thing upon it, that should "give the State any just apprehensions of the Church and clergy[a]," as his lordship suggests we have done; for as he was one of the greatest men that ever lived, so he was bred if not born in Geneva, lived and died a layman, and wrote this treatise of the true estate of the Church against the papal supremacy and usurpations of the Church, as perverted by the court of Rome. Nothing but the pure evidence of truth, as he found it in the ancient Church writers, could have made him write so impartially of the true and false, or real and pretended, liberty of the Church, as he hath done in the treatise; and as his lordship may rectify his own wrong notions by his right ones, and particularly see to how little purpose in his Appendix he hath brought so many examples from Christian emperors employing their imperial power for the good and service of the Church[b], to prove that it is not independent of the State. In short, I think his lordship may find a satisfactory answer to all that he hath written, both in his Charge and in his Appendix, against the independency of the Church, if he will read it without prejudice, and not doubting but he will con-

In 1714, Bedford was fined a thousand marks and imprisoned for three years, for writing, printing, and publishing The hereditary Right of the Crown of England asserted, fol. 1713. He bore the punishment to screen the real author, the Rev. George Harbin, a nonjuring clergyman. He was consecrated a bishop by the nonjuring succession, Jan. 25, 1720, and died Nov. 25, 1724.]

[z] [Is. Casauboni Epistolæ, 2 tom. fol. Roterod., 1709.]

[a] Charge, p. 13.

[b] [Appendix to Visitation Charge, p. 29. Trimnel says, "Having said in the foregoing discourse that after the conversion of Constantine, several things of great importance in religion were done purely by the imperial authority; I shall for the better clearing this matter, give such a further account of it here, as may if possible remove the chief objections that are brought from antiquity against this assertion." The Appendix consists of such instances of the exercise of imperial authority, and answers to the arguments derived from the letter of Hosius to Constantine in the treatise of St. Athanasius Ad Monachos, § 34, (Op., tom. i. p. 370, F. 371, B,) and that of St. Ambrose to Valentinian, (Ep. xxi. Op., tom. ii. p. 861, A.)]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

sider it well, I must refer him to it for his conviction and satisfaction, and hope it will convince him, that wherein I am so unhappy as to have him differ from me, he is in the wrong, and that I am in the right.

And then because he is pleased to write as if I had magnified the priestly office too much, I have added what two great men, Dr. George Downame[c] afterwards bishop of Londonderry and Dr. Jackson[d] have said on that subject, [and I think it very proper and pertinent to add the tract of St. Ephraim Syrus *de Sacerdotio*, as I find it in the Latin translation of his works by Gerardus Vossius Tungrensis, which I had not met with before. St. Ephraim, as he was a most holy, so he was a most learned man, and the wonder not only of St. Basil the Great, but of the Greek and Syrian Churches in the fourth century[e],] and to those additions I also humbly refer his lordship for second thoughts, and my own justification, and I hope when he reads them he will be more candid towards me, unless he can also think that what they have written on that subject, they "urge purely because it magnifies the priestly office." But what I have said on the independent power, the right to offer sacrifice, and the commission to forgive sins, I have urged, as he speaks, to magnify the sacerdotal office: have I not abundantly shewed that the most holy fathers have done the same? Did not St. Paul magnify the apostolic office from the Apostles being Christ's ambassadors and stewards of the mysteries of God, and challenge the esteem and obedience of the people upon that account? And would it not look more like the speech of a deist, than of a true and faithful Christian, to say, "that we should not be forward to entertain, what he urged purely to magnify our office,

[2 Cor. 5. 20.]
[1 Cor. 4. 1.]

[c] Appendix, No. 4. [An extract from a sermon upon 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2. Of the dignity and duty of the ministry, preached by George Downame, D.D., and published at London, 1608.]

[d] Appendix, No. 9. [An extract from his second book of Comments upon the Apostles' Creed, n. 5. c. 4.]

[e] [Added from Supplement, 1715, No. 2. p. 7. This tract is contained in the works of St. Ephraem. (Gr. et Lat.) tom. iii. p. 1. Rome, 1732. The translation of Ger. Vossius was published at Rome in three volumes, respectively sent out in 1589, 1593, 1598, and at Cologne in 1603 and 1616. The testimony of St. Basil is in his Hexaem., Hom. ii. § 6. (Op., tom. i. p. 185. Paris. 1721.) *Σύρου ἀνδρὸς σοφίας κοσμικῆς τοσοῦτον ἀφεστηκότος, ὅσον ἐγγὺς ἦν τῆς τῶν ἀληθινῶν ἐπιστήμης*, which, with many others, will be found prefixed to the works of St. Ephraem, tom. i. pp. xxxiii—li.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

before we have thoroughly considered it." As to the power of offering sacrifice, and the commission of forgiving sins, the one as well as the other is to be found in the primitive form of consecrating a bishop, which I have cited, and translated in the Christian Priesthood[f]. And then particularly as for the power, I mean the ministerial power of sacrificing, his lordship may find that urged to magnify the priesthood, in St. Clement's 1 Epist. ad Cor. cap. xliv., and by St. Cyprian, Epist. v. and lxvii. [lxviii.], which with others I do not cite at large here, because they are so cited in my book. But if we must be censured, and censured by bishops, for magnifying the priest's office from these powers, then I can only say with St. Clement, in the place just now cited: *Μακάριοι οἱ προοδοιπορήσαντες πρεσβύτεροι οἵτινες ἔγκαρπον καὶ τελείαν ἔσχον τὴν ἀνάλυσιν, οὐ γὰρ εὐλαβοῦνται μή τις αὐτοὺς μεταστήσῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱδρυμένου αὐτοῖς τόπου.*

But then, as none of those three doctrines, which his lordship charges us "to have stretched for the honour of the clergy," are more liable to vulgar misconstruction, or apter to create in the people an ill opinion of it, than that of the power of forgiving sins, I must intreat his lordship to explain what he means in saying we "have advanced the power of sacerdotal absolution in such a manner, as if there was a power of forgiving sins, properly speaking, lodged in the Church, or the priests and ministers of it[g];" for first, if by "the power of forgiving sins, properly speaking," he means an absolute arbitrary power of forgiving without the condition of repentance, as well as with it, I must beg leave to say, that I think it is not in the power of God Himself to forgive sins without repentance, there being a necessary and eternal congruity between pardon and penitence. So that repentance is not a positive, but a natural condition to qualify the sinner even for God's pardon; and I never heard of any man who was so mad as to assert, that it was in the power of the Church, or her priests, to forgive sins in this

[f] [Ch. ii. sect. 10. § 6. In the third edition there follows "where I must observe that in the Greek, between the words Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and δι' οὗ σοι, are left out by chance τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, of which the reader may be pleased to take notice." In the corrected copy "dele" is written in the margin against these words. The words have been inserted in their proper places.]

[g] Charge, p. 19.

sense. But secondly, if by the power of forgiving sins, properly speaking, he means an original, immediate, principal, or architectonical power, which in temporal pardons belongs to kings, and in spiritual pardons only, and properly speaking, to God, (in which sense it is said, "who can forgive sins but God alone?") then I must say again, I never knew any man so abandoned to truth and good sense, as to assert, that the Church or her ministers had power to forgive sins in this sense, as in temporal cases it belongs to the sovereign power, and in spiritual to God alone. But then if by the power of forgiving sins, properly speaking, he means as he ought to mean, that conditional, ministerial, derivative power of forgiving sins, which God in a proper sense, or properly speaking, hath committed to His Church and her priests, then I acknowledge, that not only we upon whom his lordship would be understood to reflect, but all the ancient and sober modern writers upon the power of absolution, have asserted such a power of forgiving sins to be lodged in the Church, and the priests of it, by derivation and commission from God, as it is written "whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." In this sense of remitting sins, those very writers which he cites do assert the power of forgiving sins, properly speaking, to be lodged in the Church, and her priests. Mr. Thorndike asserts it in the passages which his lordship cites[h],

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

[Mark 2. 7.]

[John 20. 23.]

[h] ["Mr. Thorndike, a known friend to all the just authority of the Church, refers his readers to him, [Archbishop Ussher] when he has delivered his own opinion more than once, in or near these words. 'The Church hath received of God no power to forgive sins immediately; as if it were in the Church to pardon sin, without that disposition which, by the gospel, qualifieth a man for it; or as if the act of the Church pardoning did produce it. But inasmuch as the knowledge thereof directeth, and the authority thereof constraineth to use the means which the gospel prescribeth, insomuch is the remission of sins thereby obtained, truly ascribed to the Church.' Epilogue, [book iii. c. 9.] p. 81; and he quotes a passage out of the epistle of Firmilianus to St. Cyprian, [Ep. lxxv. pp. 143, 144. ed. Ben.] exactly agreeable to his own sense, [c. 10,] p. 91. But then he adds a little after, [p. 94,] that 'there is no tradition to evidence, that no sin after baptism can obtain remission but by the Church,' and he thinks it may without it. He says indeed, and very truly, that 'he who refuses the ministry of the Church (tendering him a reasonable presumption of attaining reconcilement with God by the means of it, according to the just laws of Christianity) can have no cause to promise himself pardon without it.' p. 94. But out of this case he supposes he has proved that 'a man's own Christianity may supply that means of forgiveness which the keys of the Church fail of procuring;' for that 'in the case of *clave errante*, it is manifest there is no remission by the keys, and yet remission is to be had, by the gospel, antecedent to the Church.' p. 97."—Visit. Charge, pp. 19, 20.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

and he will pardon me if I say, I think to no purpose; but more expressly in the passages, to which I here refer him, as well as the reader, for the justification of those upon whom he reflects. "The power of the keys is the foundation of the Church," and "is seen [much] more towards them that are already of the Church, than them" (the Catechumens) "that are not of it."... "Therefore, though the power of the keys is seen in free admitting to the communion of the Church; yet is it more visible in excluding from the same, as well as in readmitting to it[i]." "Inward repentance .... is a disposition qualifying a man for (the) pardon of sin, by virtue of the covenant of grace, without any act of the Church passing upon it. But God hath charged His Church, ... and therefore given it power and right, to call all those that notoriously transgress that Christianity which once they have professed, to those demonstrations of inward repentance and amendment of mind, by visible actions, that may satisfy the Church, that God's wrath in regard of that sin is appeased through Christ, and upon these demonstrations, to readmit them to communion with the Church. And further, God, having provided this means of procuring and assuring the pardon of sin by the Church, hath also obliged all Christians to make use of the same, by bringing their secret sins to the knowledge of the Church, so far, and in as much as they ought to stand convict, that the ministry of the Church is requisite to procure in them that disposition, which, by the gospel, entitles them to forgiveness[k]." The Scripture doth "evidence, that God hath instituted and appointed the ministry of His Church for the reconciling of those sins, which must or which may come to the know-

Matt. 16. 19. [Matt. 18. 18.] John 20. 19, [23.]

ledge of His Church. For when God giveth first to St. Peter the keys of His Church, and afterwards, to all His disciples the power of binding and loosing sins, &c." ...."But he that thinketh, that, within the Church, the power of the keys goes no further than preaching, &c.[l]" "And if our Lord, by inferring immediately a general promise of hearing the prayers of

[Matt. 18. 19.]

[i] Epilogue. Of the Laws of the Church, book iii. ch. 9. p. 73.

[k] Ibid., p. 74.

[l] Ibid., p. 77. [The passage continues, "and clearing the scandal of notorious offences, can give no reason, why those that are converted to believe Christianity by preaching the gospel, should be bound by their own profession to oblige themselves to it, and by that means to enter the society of the Church."]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

Christians, intend to intimate, that He would accept of the prayers of the Church, for the reconciling of those whose sins were bound, as I observed afore; then of necessity something more than shewing the guilt of sin by preaching, is referred to the Church, in procuring the loosing of him that is bound, from the debt of sin, not from the scandal of it[m]." To the same purpose he speaks at large in p. 79. "But he who is thus recovered to life by the ministry of the Church, is not yet loosed by the bands of his sin, till he be loosed by the Church, because he was first bound by it; as our Lord, having raised Lazarus to life, commands him to be loosed by His Apostles. For if he who accepteth of the gospel and the terms of it, remain bound to be baptized by the Church for the remission of his sin; is it strange that he, who hath forfeited his pardon obtained by the Church, even in the judgment and knowledge of the Church, should not obtain the restoring of it but by the act of the Church? And therefore the Church remitteth sin after baptism, not only as a physician, prescribing the cure, but as a judge, admitting it to be effected. And the satisfaction of the Church presupposeth that God is satisfied, that is to say, His wrath appeased, and His favour regained, by the means which the Church prescribeth; but requireth also that he submit, not only to use the cure which the Church prescribeth, but to the judgment thereof in admitting the effect of it[n]." There are many more strong and plain expressions in this author for the power of the keys, and the exercise of them, too long to be transcribed, particularly in pp. 84, 85, 91, 97, 105 [o]. Some of which are more especially to be observed, as where he asserts that "the greatest part of Christians are bound in conscience to have recourse to the power of the Church, and the keys thereof, for the cure of those sins which are not of themselves notorious[p]." And therefore he is for the confession of secret sins, for which he vouches the authority of Origen[q];

[m] Ibid., p. 78.

[n] Ibid., p. 82.

[o] Ibid., chapters ix, x, xi.

[p] [Ibid., p. 85. Thorndike's words are "that the most part . . . are, for the most part, bound," &c.]

[q] [pp. 93, 94. "Origen in Psal. xxxvii. Hom. ii. advises to look about you for a skilful physician, to whom you may open the disease of your soul: good reason . . . but when he adviseth further, that if he think the sin fit to be declared to the assembly of the Church, as where it is to be cured, doth he not require necessary penance, upon voluntary confessions?"

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

and farther saith, that he "must freely glorify God, by freely professing that no Christian kingdom or state can maintain itself to be that which it pretendeth more effectually, than by giving force and effect to the law of private confession once a year[r]." And what is also to be observed by his lordship is, that one reason he gives why the godly discipline of putting notorious sinners to penance at the beginning of Lent could not take place at the Reformation, was, that "the tares of puritanism were sowed together with the grain

and p. 97, "I have given you the testimony of Origen directing to make choice of some of the presbyters of the Church, to make acquainted with secret sin, &c."] Hom. ii. in Ps. xxxvii. [§ 6. Op., tom. ii. p. 688. col. i. F.] "Vide ergo quid edocet nos scriptura divina, quia oportet peccatum non celare intrinsecus. Fortassis enim sicut ii qui habent intus inclusam escam indigestam, aut humoris vel phlegmatis stomacho graviter et moleste imminentis abundantiam, si vomuerint relevantur: ita etiam hi qui peccaverunt, si quidem occultant, et retinent intra se peccatum, intrinsecus urgentur, et propemodum suffocantur a phlegmate vel humore peccati. Si autem [peccator] ipse sui accusatur fiat, dum accusat semetipsum, et confitetur, simul evomit et delictum, atque omnem morbi digerit causam. Tantummodo circumspice diligentius, cui debeas confiteri peccatum tuum. Proba prius medicum, cui debeas causam languoris exponere, qui sciat infirmari cum infirmante, flere cum flente, qui condolendi et compatiendi noverit disciplinam: ut ita demum si quid ille dixerit, qui se prius et eruditum medicum ostenderit et misericordem, si quid consilii dederit, facias et sequaris, si intellexerit et præviderit talem esse languorum tuum qui in conventu totius ecclesiæ exponi debeat, et curari, ex quo fortassis et cæteri ædificari poterunt, et tu ipse facile sanari; multa hoc deliberatione, et satis perito medici illius consilio procurandum est. 'Quoniam iniquitatem meam ego pronunciabo, et cogitabo pro peccato meo.' Quicumque vestrum conscius sibi est in aliquo peccato, et ita securus est quasi nihil mali fecerit, commoveatur ex hoc sermone qui dicit: cogitabo pro peccato meo." And who is meant by the physician, to whom Origen would have the sinner confess, is plain from the beginning of his first Homily on this Psalm.—[ibid., p. 680. col. i. C. "Et sicut (Deus) corpori medicamenta præparavit .... ita etiam animæ medicamenta præparavit . . . ut hi qui aliqua ægritudine fuerint oppressi, statim ut vim morbi senserint . . .] requirant aptum et convenientem sibi rationabilem disciplinam, quæ eis ex præceptis Dei possit mederi: nam tradidit et medicinæ artis industriam, cujus archiatros est Salvator dicens de se, quia 'non opus habent qui sani sunt medico, sed qui male habent.' Et ille quidem erat archiatros qui posset curare omnem languorem et omnem infirmitatem: discipuli vero ejus Petrus vel Paulus, sed et Prophetæ medici sunt, et hi omnes qui post Apostolos in Ecclesia positi sunt, quibusque curandorum vulnerum disciplina commissa est, quos voluit Deus in Ecclesia sua esse medicos animarum." Both these homilies are worthy to be read by all clergymen.

In the MS. notes there is added, "For 'Ps. xxxii.'" (as it was incorrectly printed in the third edition,) "read 'xxxvii.' and add, 'vid. Hom. ii. super Levit.'" The passage referred to is in § 4. Op., tom. ii. p. 191. col. i. B, C. "Est adhuc et septima, licet dura et laboriosa, per pœnitentiam remissio peccatorum, cum lavat peccator in lacrymis stratum suum, et fiunt ei lacrymæ suæ panes die ac nocte, et cum non erubescit sacerdoti Domini indicare peccatum suum, et quærere medicinam, secundum eum qui ait: 'Dixi pronuntiabo adversum me injustitiam meam Domino, et tu remisisti impietatem cordis mei.' In quo impletur et illud, quod Jacobus Apostolus dicit: 'si quis autem infirmatur, vocet presbyteros Ecclesiæ, et imponant ei manus, &c.'"]

[r] [Thorndike, ibid.,] p. 104.

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

of reformation in the Church of England[s]." It is very true what he asserts, 'that the Church hath no power to forgive sins immediately, nor to pardon any person's sin without that disposition of true repentance which qualifieth a man for it[t],' without which the act of the Church in loosing sinners is ineffectual; in which sense the saying of Firmilian cited by our author out of Cyprian is true, that penitents 'do not obtain remission of sins from, or by the act of the Church,' but by their own repentance[u]; but then he asserts on the other hand, 'that God hath appointed the ministry of the Church for the reconcilement of those sins, which come to the knowledge of the Church;' and that the act of the Church is as necessary to readmit public penitents, as at first to admit catechumens, when qualified, to become the disciples of Christ[x]. He also asserts, as the bishop observes, that 'a man's own Christianity may supply the means of forgiveness, where there is no remission by the keys of the Church, as in the case of *clave errante*[y],' where the bishop by prejudice or too much severity keeps bound those whom he ought to loose; of which there is a terrible censure, Const. Apost., lib. ii. cap. 21[z]. And here in answer to the bishop I must profess, that I know none of the Church of England who have written of the power of the keys or sacerdotal absolution, without these exceptions, restrictions, and abatements. As for my own justification I must inform his lordship I did it in my Prefatory Answer to the Book of the Rights, as he may find it, [sect. ix.] There he may find from St. Cyprian[a], that sacerdotal absolution hath no effect, where the penitent deceives the Church and her ministers appointed to loose sinners; and there are several cases more too long to be considered here, as when a priest for filthy lucre absolves a sinner,

[s] [Ibid.,] p. 105.

[t] [Ibid., p. 81. in substance.]

[u] [Ibid., p. 91. The passage is from Ep. lxxv. Firmiliani Episcopi Cæsareæ Cappadociæ ad Cyprianum contra Epistolam Stephani. "He saith that they used in their parts to hold synods every year, 'ut si qua graviora sunt, communi consilio dirigantur; lapsis quoque fratribus, et post lavacrum salutare a diabolo vulneratis, per pœnitentiam medela quæratur; non quasi a nobis remissionem peccatorum consequantur, sed ut per nos ad intelligentiam delictorum suorum convertantur, et Domino plenius satisfacere cogantur.'"—S. Cypr. Op., p. 144.]

[x] [Ibid., p. 77. in substance.]

[y] [Ibid., p. 97, "which the keys of the Church fail of procuring." Thorndike.]

[z] [Concil., tom. i. pp. 249—252.]

[a] [Epist. lix. ad Antonianum. S. Cypr. Opera, p. 71, and Epist. liv. ad Cornelium, ibid., p. 78.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

whom he ought to keep bound. This as odious a case and as scandalous as it is, was the case of Zosimus the presbyter; who as it appears from above thirty epistles of Isidorus Pelusiota to him, was one of the vilest and most scandalous for several vices, but particularly for avarice and luxury, that ever was in the Church of God. This fellow abusing his priestly character and profession, for "filthy lucre's sake[b]," absolved a perjured person for a dish of fish, without obliging him to make restitution to the innocent person injured by his perjury; for which wickedness Isidore tells him of one who said he was worthy to be put to death; and then telling him how he had perverted and depraved the gospel, he saith that the power of loosing is to be understood of those who are penitent; that he is not loosed who sweetens[c] the priest by gifts, but he who satisfies the injured person to whom he did wrong. And then most excellently setting forth his great abuse of the priestly power, and the place of the gospel upon which it is grounded, in expressions too long to be transcribed, he tells him, that priests were *λειτουργοὶ, οὐ κοινωνοὶ*, only "ministers, not consorts," or parcenors[d] (with the Holy Ghost[e]) of the power of absolution; *πρέσβεις, οὐ κριταὶ*, "legates," or deputies, who ought to act within the limits of their commission, and "not (civil) judges," whose mistaken or unjust judgments acquit criminals; *μεσίται, οὐ βασιλεῖς*, "mediators" who absolve penitents by their prayers, and intercessions for them, and "not kings," who can pardon or not pardon, as they please; "for they, as the Apostle speaks, who offer sacrifices for their own sins cannot as by their own arbitrary power forgive sins to impenitents, though they are never so rich[f]," &c.

I believe there is not one of those upon whom his lordship

[b] Lib. iii. Epist. 260. *κερδοὺς ἕνεκεν αἰσχροῦ.* [S. Isidori Pelusiotæ Epist., pp. 361, E. 363, C. All the references are to one Epistle.]

[c] [*τὸ ἐὰν λύσητε περὶ γνωσιμαχούντων ἀπολύεται δὲ τοῦ ἐγκλήματος οὐχ ὁ τὸν ἱερέα ἐκμειλισσόμενος, ἀλλ' ὁ τὸν ἀδικηθέντα ἐξευμενιζόμενος.*—Ibid., p. 362, B.]

[d] [Coheirs, who altogether make but one heir, and have but one estate among them. See Blackstone's Commentaries, book ii. chap. 12.]

[e] [*Εἰ τοίνυν διὰ τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα, ταύτην εἰλήφασι τὴν ἐξουσίαν.* [p. 363, B.]

[f] [*λείτουργοι γάρ εἰσιν οὐ κοινωνοὶ· πρέσβεις, οὐ κριταὶ· μεσίται οὐ βασιλεῖς·] οἱ γὰρ καὶ περὶ οἰκείων ἁμαρτημάτων, [ὡς ἔφη ὁ Ἀπόστολος, θυσίας προσφέροντες, οὐκ ἂν δήπου ἐξ αὐθεντίας τοῖς ἀμετανοήτοις, εἰ καὶ πλούσιοι εἶεν, δύναιντ' ἀφεῖναι ἁμαρτίας.* pp. 362, E. 363, A.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

reflects for advancing the power of sacerdotal absolution, but who will give their assent to every word of Isidore's letter to that wicked Zosimus, and would write such another to any priest now upon the same occasion. Nay I dare say that "learned and pious" laic, whom he singles out in his reflections[g], will approve the whole of this epistle to that wicked priest; and therefore I hope his lordship will pardon me for saying, that he hath cited it to no purpose against him.

I confess the expressions he cites out of him seem a little unguarded, but the substance of what he writes is true, and may be admitted with a very little candid allowance and abatement from the strict manner in which he expresses his meaning; for the bishop will not, I believe, deny that "sacerdotal absolution is" (ordinarily) "necessary for the remission of sins, even of those who are truly penitent[h];" nor that "God hath obliged Himself to ratify the absolution of the Church[i]" for the remission of sins to those who are qualified for it by repentance. Neither I suppose will he deny, that "the administration of the holy Eucharist is the ordinary means of conveying the sacerdotal absolution of sins after baptism," as baptism is the ordinary means of conveying the sacerdotal absolution of sins to the baptized, which they committed before baptism[k]. Nor will he deny, I take it for granted, that "the priest is the judge competent[l]," to whom the Sacraments shall be administered, and to whom not; whether the penitent sinner after baptism shall be loosed by giving him the Sacrament of the holy Eucharist for the remission of his sins, or by a verbal absolution. Neither can his lordship, I think, deny that 'as priests were made, or instituted for the administration of the Sacraments; so the Sacraments were instituted to be administered by the priests, and that to admi-

[g] [Visitation Charge, p. 20, 21. "A late pious and learned writer, who may be thought of the greater authority in this matter, for not being in orders himself." The person referred to is Henry Dodwell, late Camden Professor of History. See "A Præmonition, that sacerdotal absolution is necessary for the remission of sins, even of those who are truly penitent," prefixed to his "Epistolary Discourse, proving that the soul is naturally mortal, but immortalized actually," p. 62. London 1706.]

[h] [Dodwell, Præmon., p. 62.]

[i] ["(Priests) alone can oblige God to ratify in heaven what is transacted by them in earth, by the authority they have received from God Himself." Præmon., p. 66.]

[k] [Præmon., p. 63, 64.]

[l] [Præmon., p. 67.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

nister them is their proper right[m].' Nor will he, I presume, make any difficulty to grant, that 'as God hath given the power of the temporal sword to princes, for the preservation of their authority as well as for the benefit of their people, so He hath given the power of the keys and of administering of the Sacraments to His priests for the preservation and maintenance of their authority, as well as for the benefit of the people[n].' These certainly are co-ordinate ends of the sacerdotal power; but which of the two was the principal or primary in God's intention may perhaps admit of some dispute, especially if it be considered, that God could have given remission of sins to true believers before baptism, and true penitents after it, without obliging them to depend upon the sacramental or verbal absolution of His priests, for the remission of their sins, as the ordinary condition or means by which it was to be obtained. For this reason, I say, it may admit of some little dispute, which of these two co-ordinate ends is the chief; though I am of the bishop's opinion[o], that the sacerdotal power and "Sacraments, were primarily designed" by God "for the benefit of the people," especially if his lordship will admit, that 'the securing of their obedience' to their priests by their dependence upon them is, as certainly it is, much for their benefit[p]. And if he will grant this, as one would think he should, then I think there will be very little, if any, difference betwixt his lordship, and that learned writer of the laity, whom he hath taken so much pains to confute and expose[q].

[m] [Præmon., pp. 64, 65.]

[n] [Præmon., p. 66.]

[o] [Charge, p. 21.]

[p] ["The design of all this seems to be to oblige all laics to a voluntary obedience to their clergy (even in times of persecution, when no other means can be used) by a sense of their own greatest interest, which is so highly concerned in paying that obedience."—Præm., p. 66.]

[q] ["(His words) seem to me pretty extraordinary. I confess I always thought that the Sacraments were primarily designed for the benefit of believers, as a means of conveying pledges assuring them of the grace of the gospel; and that priests were made for the Sacraments, and not the Sacraments for the priests: whereas this author advances the contrary, and even after he has made receiving the Sacraments the ordinary means of receiving remission of sins, and supposed the priests obliged by Christ Himself to signify their consent and approbation of persons by giving the external symbols, he calls them arbitrary means, of which the priest is the competent judge, whether we shall use them or a verbal absolution; THE PRIEST'S RIGHT AND NOT THE COMMUNICANT'S BEING HERE PRINCIPALLY CONCERNED."—Visit. Charge, p. 21.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

Thus much I thought fit to say by way of animadversion upon what his lordship has written[r] upon 'the three principal opinions, and the zealous promoters of them in behalf of the clergy, to advance their honour and dignity.' And here I leave him to consider of all that I have written for his sake, as well as my own, who am one of those more especially pointed at in his charge. Only I beg the liberty of his lordship, at parting, to beseech him to consider, that if we in a just zeal for the priesthood, had carried those three points a little too high, as for my own part I am satisfied I have not, whether it became a bishop to make a whole charge against us, to expose us for so venial a transgression, without any regard to the time when, and the place where we wrote, or the just provocations which moved us to write. I think had his lordship considered these things, an apology for us would have better become him, than a criminal charge to the clergy against us.

But besides all these considerations, there is one more particular which induced me to write as I have done, for the honour and dignity of the priesthood of both orders, and that is the Gothic constitution, wherein the secular honours of the clergy have occasioned not only the people, but priests themselves, in a great measure to forget their spiritual dignity, as priests. In the empire it is observable, that the dignified clergy are not only more valued, but also generally value themselves more as princes, palatines, and lords, than as bishops and priests; and in other kingdoms of the Gothic constitution, it may now and then be seen, that as Paulus Samosatenus affected the secular title of *ducenarius*[s] before that of bishop, so some prelates are so dazzled with the splendour of their titles, as nobles of the realm, it may be peers; or as in some kingdoms, as dukes and peers, that they think their dignity greater as lords and judges of parliament, and value themselves more as such, than as they are Christ's vicegerents and bishops, and senators of the Church. In kingdoms of such a tempting constitution, especially in kingdoms which are sunk into the dregs thereof, and where priests as priests

[r] Charge, p. 5.

[s] [Sic dicebantur Procuratores qui ducenta sestertia annui salarii nomine accipiebant a principe.—Vales. not. ad locum. Eusebius, H. E. lib. vii. c. 30. p. 361.]

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

are growing into contempt, it can never be unseasonable to magnify the priesthood, and put both laity and clergy in mind of the sacerdotal dignity, especially from such monuments of the ancient Church, as shew both what the laity, emperors and kings not excepted, thought of priests in the purest times, and what priests who were saints and martyrs, or otherwise eminent for the love of souls and the contempt of the world, thought and wrote of themselves, and of their spiritual authority as priests. His lordship might have also considered, that we, whom he is pleased to mark out and distinguish from other writers by a particular characteristic[t], as promoters of the 'three opinions' which, he saith, 'have lately been revived,' have not been revived by us for any worldly end or interest, but purely for the love of truth, and to promote both the temporal and eternal happiness of the people, as well as the honour of the priests. We are not in the interests of the world, which hath deprived us; but, as the generality of the world in this iron-age hath been for many years, it had been much more for our worldly ease and interest to have lowered the priesthood in our writings, to have nailed the ears of the Church in them to the door-posts of the State, to have flattered the empire into an absolute spiritual supremacy over the Church; to have opposed the proper priesthood of the clergy, to have writ them down into a stipendiary ministry, or to have published books of sceptical subjects, which gratify the animal life, and are highly grateful to flesh and blood. Had we written as the men of latitude do, and employed our pens as free thinkers, to rescue the enslaved world from the craft and tyranny of her priests, we had been the favourites of all the enemies of the Church and her clergy; but without any worldly view, or design to please men, we have written for truth, for sober, primitive, catholic truths in behalf of both; for truths, of which even the bishop, and those of his clergy who desired him to print his charge against us, we hope may by God's blessing upon our books, find the benefit, though we can reap no other benefit by them, than to have the satisfaction of seeing the doctrines his lordship saith we have revived, re-

[t] [As "those of the late separation."] Charge, p. 5, 6.

vive the veneration which the people ought to have for their priests, and the value and reverence which their priests ought to have for themselves, as the ministers of God[u].

ACCOUNT OF THIRD EDITION.

[u] The Ordering of Priests. "You have heard, brethren, of what dignity, and of how great importance this office is, whereunto you are called, and now again we exhort you in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you have in remembrance into how high a dignity, and to how weighty an office and charge you are called. . . . Forasmuch then as your office is of so great excellency, and of so great difficulty . . . that you may shew yourselves dutiful and thankful unto that Lord, who hath placed you in so high a dignity."

TO THE

AUTHOR OF A BOOK

FALSELY ENTITULED

THE RIGHTS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH ASSERTED[a].

SIR,

LETTER TO AUTHOR OF RIGHTS.

WHEN I began the following preface, I did not intend to make it so long, as at first only designing to make a few re-

[a] [This letter was not in the third edition: it was printed in the Supplement of 1715, No. I. p. 1, with this title, "The Letter to the Author of the Rights, prefixed to the two former editions of this book, but casually omitted by mistake in the third edition."

The full title of this once celebrated work was "The Rights of the Christian Church asserted, against the Romish and all other Priests who claim an independent authority over it; with a preface concerning the government of the Church of England as by law established. London, 1706."

Matthew Tindal, D.C.L., appears now to have been generally recognised as the author. There are frequent allusions to him in this work, as "the reputed author" of the Rights, &c. He was the son of a clergyman, "the son of a priest," at Beerferris in Devonshire, and born about the year 1657. In 1672 he entered the University as a Commoner of Lincoln college, where he was Hickes's pupil: he thence removed, about the time Hickes left the University, to Exeter college, and after taking the degree of B.A. in 1676, was elected a Fellow of All Souls', (Wood's Athenæ, vol. ii. p. 1011. fol.,) and continued so, "eating founder's bread," till his death. During his residence in Oxford he took up the received principles of Church authority, till associating with persons of Roman Catholic opinions, (the Master of University college, Obadiah Walker, being alluded to by Hickes as one,) and being led to think, that, on the principles he held, the cause of the Church of England was argumentatively weak, he joined the Roman communion in the early part of the year 1686, and went to Mass; but it would seem from the doubtful way in which Hickes speaks of it, ("who went over, or was going over,") that he did so without openly declaring himself. At this time he was admitted an advocate at Doctors' Commons. On going into the world, and mixing with men of different opinions, he heard his principles ridiculed; and finding the doctrine of the Roman Church other than he expected, was led, he says, (see Second Defence of Rights, pp. 172, 173,) to re-examine the subject, and concluded by entirely rejecting the doctrine of Church authority; and on the view that the English Church does not claim such authority, he returned to our communion at Easter, 1688. After this his life was chiefly spent in London, in the society of men of loose opinions, and in very dissolute practices. In 1694, when discussions about a comprehension, and alterations of the Liturgy, were on foot, particularly with regard to the doctrine of the Trinity and the Creed of St. Athanasius, Tindal "following the humour of the times," published "A Letter to the Clergy of both Universities," concerning these two articles, and the following year a defence of it. A few years after he openly expressed in con-

marks upon your book, to give the reader some specimens of your arrogant and sophistical way of reasoning, in some instances, and then leave him to judge of the rest. But when I came to consider one thing, that led me on to another, which I still thought required an answer; and so step after step I was obliged to traverse your whole book. I must therefore desire you, and my readers, of whom I am sure you will be one, to consider my preface rather as another book than a preface; and to that end I have set the contents of it before it[b], as writers commonly do before their books. Could I have foreseen it would have been so long, I would have made it a book by itself; but however I think it is all one to the reader, and the interest of truth, whether he hath an answer to your book in a joint, or a separate treatise; and those who think it not worth the while to read such an answer under the title of a preface, would, I believe, have as little mind to read it, if it were published singly in a distinct book.

When you please, Sir, to make a reply, I hope you will put your name to it, as I have put mine to this book, and thereby shew the world, that you are neither ashamed or afraid to own what you have written in your book Of the

versation the sentiments "that there neither is nor can be any revealed religion;" "that reason is sufficient for man's direction, without revelation;" "at which," says Archdeacon Proast, who was present, (see his letter to Dr. Hickes, in the Preliminary Discourse to 'Spinoza revived.') "I was the less surprised, because I knew at that time both his own inclination, and what sort of company he frequented when at London, which was usually a great part of the year." His works afterwards were chiefly directed against the clergy, and what he called priestcraft, while he still professed himself a Christian. His deistical opinions were at last fully set forth in his notorious work called "Christianity as old as the Creation," which was published in 1730, when he was seventy-three years of age. He had written a second part of this work, and partly printed it at the time of his death, which took place August 16, 1733. He was, at his own request, interred at Clerkenwell church, near Bishop Burnet.

Two editions of the Rights were published in 1706. A third and fourth in 1707. In the latter year he published two defences of his work, 1. A Defence of the Rights, &c., against a late Visitation Sermon, entitled the Rights of the Clergy in the Christian Church asserted, by W. Wotton, B.D. Lond. 1707. 2. A Second Defence of the Rights, &c. occasioned by two late indictments against a bookseller and his servant, for selling one of the said books, &c. Lond. 1707. Of these he published a second edition in 1709, as one work, in two parts, with the title, "A Defence of the Rights, &c. in two parts." 1709.

The grand jury of Middlesex, Dec. 13, 1706, made a presentment against Mr. Richard Sare and his journeyman, Mr. Williamson, for selling the work. (Second Defence, p. 91, 1709.) And on March 25, 1710, it was ordered by the House of Commons to be burnt.]

[b] [The Table of contents, which in the earlier editions was placed immediately before the Prefatory Discourse, will be found at the beginning of this volume.]

LETTER TO AUTHOR OF RIGHTS.

Rights, or the Preface to it[c], or to appear in the defence of them[d]. Ashamed you ought not to be for discovering a craft, I mean the craft of priests, who, if you write truth, have bubbled and cheated the world at least ever since the priestly office was divided from the regal; nor ought you to be afraid of publishing wholesome and seasonable doctrines, to deliver mankind from the slavery of an usurped power, under which, if men will believe you, it hath been so long in Egyptian bondage. But if the world should be so blind and ungrateful, as to persecute their deliverer, would not your sufferings carry a reward of great glory with them? And would it not be for your everlasting honour to be a confessor for detecting such errors as you pretend to refute? Pray, Sir, remember that Socrates, who died for one great truth, hath not only had statues erected, but medals struck for the honour of his memory, and by his sufferings hath left such a glorious idea of himself in the minds of men, that his name hath been transmitted to posterity, like the pictures of saints, with a glory about it, and to this day is not mentioned, but with such honour as is usually paid to the memories of such excellent men, as were or endeavoured to be reformers of their country, and benefactors to mankind. Sir, remember his great example, and fear not at a venture to publish your name, that it may live for ever, and be alway venerable with his, who attempted to deliver his country, truly priest-ridden, from the religious slavery and impositions of crafty priests. Take courage then, Sir, and let the world know your worthy

[c] [It was supposed, Walpole says, but on what foundation he does not know, that the preface to the Rights was written by Lord Somers. Biogr. Brit., article Somers.]

[d] [The author of the Rights was not certainly known in 1706. Dr. Tindal was the reputed author, or "compiler," for it was supposed to be a joint work of "the party;" thus Hickes calls him "the penman of the club," and says, "it passed through as many of their hands to patch it up as neatly as they could." See also Leslie's Vindication, Theological Works, vol. i. pp. 124, 127. fol. 1721.

In 1709, in the Preliminary Discourse to 'Spinoza revived,' Hickes says, speaking of the book of the Rights, "of which I can now certainly say that Dr. Tindal, for his immortal honour, was the compiler: for I have seen a letter of his in his own writing, wherein he owns himself to be the author of it, which as I have also heard, hath been attested by one or more of those whom he employed, as copyists or amanuenses to transcribe the work; that incomparable work of which he was so fond that he told a gentleman who found him at it with pen in hand, 'that he was writing a book which would make the clergy mad.'" And in the Rehearsal it is said, "I hear he does not deny it."]

name, that it may be immortalized with that of Mr. Bl[ount]'s[e], and T[oland]'s[f], and As[gill]'s[g], and St[ephens]'s[h], and such

[e] [The names of Blount and Asgill are filled up in the MS. additions. The same names are found associated by other contemporary writers. For instance, by Swift, "Who would ever have suspected Asgill for a wit, or Toland for a philosopher."—(1708.) Works, vol. ii. p. 474. "Tindal, Toland, Coward, Collins, Clendon, and all the tribe of free-thinkers."—(1711.) ib. vol. iii. p. 85. "Toland, Asgill, Monmouth, Collins, Tindal, and others of the fraternity."—(1713.) ib., vol. iv. p. 415.

Charles Blount, "who set himself at the head of the deists, and after whom they now copy," (Leslie, Short and Easy Method, Pref. &c.; Theol. Works, p. 7, and note to p. 24, 1721,) was born in 1654. His most notorious work was "The Life of Apollonius Tyaneus, 1680," which was soon after suppressed, because of its blasphemous character. He committed suicide in 1693. After his death C. Gildon published his remains under the name of "The Oracles of Reason," with a preface defending suicide. The "Oracles of Reason, or Miscellaneous Works of Charles Blount, Esq.," is the first work noticed in "The Axe laid to the Root of Christianity." After giving extracts from the work, and from Gildon's preface, it proceeds, (p. 2,) "The writer of these words hath since publicly begged God's and all good men's pardon for them," (Gildon was converted by reading Leslie's Plain and Easy Method, and published "The Deist's Manual," in answer to the errors he had before held); "and therefore I mention them, not with a design of reproaching him, but the age only in which he was allowed and encouraged thus to write." Blount is again mentioned by Hickes in the Prefatory Discourse, p. 250. "Thus if they were alive might Hobbes and Blount and many other sons of Belial brag."]

[f] [In the MS. notes this is filled up T[indal], which seems to be an error, as Tindal is evidently pointed at throughout the letter as the author of the Rights. Toland was a notorious infidel writer. He is mentioned with Blount and Socinus by Johnson, Pref. Epist. to the Unbloody Sacrifice, p. 26, 1714, and as Tindal's friend and helper by Leslie, Vindication, Works, vol. i. p. 124, 1721. He was "a man of most uncommon abilities, and perhaps the most learned of all the infidel writers." He was born in Ireland, in 1670, and was "bred in the Roman Catholic faith; . . . but as he was a boy of forward parts, he early shook off the superstition of his ancestors, and even before he was sixteen years of age had grown into a warm zeal against popery," and joined the dissenters. In 1696 he published a work entitled "Christianity notMysterious," which excited general indignation. On this he was offended at the dissenters, and declared himself a Latitudinarian. In 1699 he published his Amyntor, a covert attack on the Canon of Scripture, and other deistical books and pamphlets. And in 1717 one called "Pantheisticon sive formula celebrandæ sodalitatis Socraticæ," an atheistical parody on a Liturgy. He died in 1722. He was an intimate friend of Tindal's. See "The Axe laid to the Root of Christianity," p. 3.]

[g] [John Asgill, a lawyer of some eminence. Thus noticed in "The Axe laid to the Root of Christianity," p. 3: "Mr. Asgill in the year 1700 printed a book and put his name to it, with a plain design of ridiculing all revealed religion, and the belief of a future state: as may appear from the title, which is, 'An Argument proving that according to the Covenant of Eternal Life, revealed in Scripture, man may be translated from hence into that eternal life without passing through death, &c.' Some blasphemous extracts follow; then, "the key of his whole book is p. 95, where he plainly and briefly thus declares his faith, 'If I die like other men, I declare myself to die of no religion.'"

Rehearsal, No. 203, April 26, 1707:

"*Countryman.* I am quite at a loss. I must have some of your help now, master, to let me see into the bottom of his design.

"*Rehearsal.* It was this, countryman. That if he could bring as seemingly clear and evident Scriptures for this hypothesis of his as there are for the articles of our creed, and then every body finding that they die notwithstanding, it would soon follow that men would disbelieve every word of the Scriptures, and reckon them all a

other heroes, whose principles are laid bare in the Rehearsal[1],

cheat."—See also No. 204, 216, 217, 219, 220.

Being afterwards elected a member of the Irish House of Commons, he was immediately expelled and the book ordered to be burnt. After having sat in the English House as member for Bramber from 1705 to 1707, he was in the latter year expelled the House for maintaining the doctrines of that book, which was voted a blasphemous libel. His pecuniary difficulties led to his being committed to the Fleet. After his expulsion from the House "he retired first to the Mint, and then became a prisoner in the King's Bench, thence he removed to the Fleet, and continued in the rules of one or other of these prisons thirty years." He died in 1738, aged upwards of 80.—Biogr. Dict.]

[h] [The Rev. William Stephens, rector of Sutton in Surrey, is repeatedly noticed in the Rehearsal. Thus (No. 94, April 10, 1706.) "He was noted as the furiosest of the party. He justified the murder of K. Charles the First, in a sermon before the House of Commons, and printed it without the desire or leave of the House." Jan. 30, 1693-4, he had preached and afterwards published a sermon before the Lord Mayor, &c. in which he said, pp. 3, 4, "The loss of a good king gives just cause of lamentation.... But had they lived under a king, who by an open example and encouragement of debauchery, should have drawn the people from their covenant with the Lord, &c. ... it would be hard to persuade men to call such a king the breath of their nostrils." Jan. 30, 1699-700, he preached before the House of Commons the sermon alluded to above. On this there came out "Reflexions upon Mr. Stephens' Sermon preached before the House of Commons Jan. 30, 1699-700, by a Gentleman who took the said sermon in short hand. London, printed for the use of the Calves' Head Club, in order to their conversion," no date. (The Calves' Head Club was a name commonly given to this party. See the Rehearsal, No. 5, Sept. 2, 1704. For an account of this club, supposed to meet every 30th of Jan., see Life of Defoe, vol. ii. pp. 108—117. London, 1830.) P. 3. "Of all men living Mr. Stephens, considering his own circumstances, had the greatest reason in the world to have worn out his days in the greatest obscurity; and it not only accuses his own discretion, but the common prudence of all his advisers, to revive the memory of his former (and almost buried) crimes," &c. The sermon was soon printed, and reprinted with the Growth of Deism, and other infidel tracts, London, 1709. After this his party seems to have been ashamed of him. So the Rehearsal, No. 94, 1706. See also Nos. 98 and 99. On his publishing an anonymous letter reflecting on Harley and the duke of Marlborough, entitled "a Letter to the Author of the Memorial of the Church of England," (said to have been written by another person,) in 1706, he was convicted, fined 100 marks, and sentenced to stand twice in the pillory: the last was remitted, but not till he had seen it prepared for him. Boyer's Queen Anne, p. 386.]

[1] [The Rehearsal, so frequently referred to by Hickes, was a paper "in dialogue on the affairs of the times," published at first weekly, and afterwards twice a week, by Mr. Leslie. It was printed on a folio half sheet and sold for a penny. Its design will be best understood by his own account of it in the Preface to the first volume. (The Observator and Review were weekly penny papers: they were written respectively by John Tutchin, and the well known Daniel Defoe.)

"Whoever has perused the following papers, will by this time be satisfied, that the author undertook not this task to make diversion for the town, nor would let himself down to kick and cuff with Tutchin, Defoe, and the rest of the scandalous club (as they were not ashamed to call themselves,) &c.

..... The case was this. He saw great pains taken to poison the people of this nation with most pernicious principles, both as to Church and State, and even religion itself, not only as reformed among us with respect to popery, but as to all religion in general, and all revelation of God to man, that is, the Holy Scriptures, and all built upon them. The axe was laid to the root of Christianity; and deism (which they call natural religion) set up in its place. And how monstrously this has prevailed amongst us of late years I am sorry I need not inform the reader, for it has not been made a secret, nor can escape the ob-

and in The Axe laid to the Root of Christianity[k], that you may be as glorious in your ashes after you are dead, as one of

LETTER TO AUTHOR OF RIGHTS.

servation of any who read our pamphlets and papers, or indeed who keeps any conversation. Their books and pamphlets have been solidly and seriously answered. But their papers have been neglected, that is, their weekly penny papers, which go through the nation like newspapers, and have done much more mischief than the others. For the greatest part of the people do not read books. Most of them cannot read at all. But they will gather together about one that can read, and listen to an Observator or Review (as I have seen them in the streets), where all the principles of rebellion are instilled into them, and they are taught the doctrine of priestcraft, to banter religion and the Holy Scriptures; and are told most villainous lies and stories of the clergy, which they suck in greedily and are prejudiced beyond expression. . . . . .

The remedy for this was but one of two, either to put a stop to these pernicious papers, or to answer them. The first was not in my power, and the second was very disagreeable to me, because the answer must be in the same method as these papers, to come out weekly, and to be read by the people. . . . . And to procure them to listen to such an antidote, the design must not appear at first, for people so prejudiced would not bear it. Therefore it was necessary, that at first setting out, those papers should bear an humorous title, and begin with that pleasantry and fooling with which they were so much taken in the other papers. . . . .

For this reason I borrowed the title of that most humorous and ingenious of our plays, called the Rehearsal. . . .

I think myself abundantly rewarded for the pains I have taken by the success (far more than I expected) which they have had in recovering not a few from those errors into which they have been led."

And in the Postscript to the first volume, "And I began it with that diffidence, and so unwillingly, that I thought not to continue it, only would try my hand a little; I could not forbear to throw one bucket into the fire which I saw devouring Church and State. . . . . .

And when I several times grew weary and would have rested myself, those of better judgment, and who I knew wished well to religion, the Church, and the nation, would allow me no respite, and said I could not serve these better."

The first paper entitled "The OBSERVATOR on the libel called Cassandra, from Wednesday, August the 2nd, to Saturday, August the 5th, 1704," was without any name of its own, but appearing from the large letters in which the word Observator is printed to be a number of that paper. It was continued every Saturday, as The Rehearsal, till April 10, 1706, when it was sent out each Wednesday and Saturday, till March 26, 1709, when the work was suppressed by the government; Burnet calls them "seditious libels, and wonders the government connived at them."—Own Times, vol. ii. p. 538. fol.

The Nos. up to No. 250, Wednesday, Oct. 8, 1707, were collected in one vol. and published with a Preface, Index, and Postscript added, and this title, "A View of the Times, their principles and practices, in the first volume of the Rehearsal, by Philalethes. London, 1708." Three half-yearly volumes followed, each with a Preface and Index. The whole were reprinted with "Cassandra," in 6 vols. 12mo. in 1750, under the same title.]

[k] "The Axe laid to the Root of Christianity, or a specimen of the profaneness and blasphemy that abounds in some late writings," so often referred to by Hickes, is a tract of eight pages small quarto. Printed for John Morphew in 1706, and sold for twopence. It is in the form of a letter dated Nov. 21, 1706, and consists of passages extracted from recently published works, and was sent out in that cheap form to awaken public attention to the blasphemy which was in circulation; the authorship of it is attributed to Atterbury. "Infidelity used heretofore to skulk and hide its head . . . it now walks open and barefaced . . . We owe the rise of this infection to the times of the Great Rebellion, when the hypocritical and false pretences of many men to religion drove many others into a contrary extreme. That storm blew over, and a long calm succeeded: the ease and luxury of which time carried us yet

LETTER TO AUTHOR OF RIGHTS.

them[1] already is, and the rest, Mr. Asgill not excepted, will in a little time be.

But, Sir, you have other reasons, and more convincing, why you need not much fear to own what you write by name, as I have done here. But shame and fear set apart, generosity and the laws of combat seem also to require you to put your name to what you write. For otherwise I, and your other antagonists must engage against you with disadvantage, and combat you, as some are said to have fought with ghosts, seeing only your weapon, and the glitterings of it, but not the hand that wields it; which is thought so unequal and unfair, that very able and skilful writers of controversy have told their adversaries in their answers, that if they replied they would take their replies for nothing, unless they published them with their names.

I am sure I have more reason to be afraid of owning what I have written, than you; for if those who have a larger sphere of conversation than I, tell me truth, there are now too great numbers of almost all ranks and conditions, who will revile me, and persecute me, and say all manner of evil, and with all bitterness against me, for the sake of those old, I had almost said antiquated, principles, which I have endeavoured to defend against you, and to do me all the mischief they can. But none of these things move me; for I put my trust in God, whose institutions and truths, I think, they are which I endeavour to maintain against you, and all others who give themselves the character of men of "large thoughts," and value themselves as "free thinkers;" and who delight to misrepresent all principles, which are uneasy to flesh and blood, and contrary to worldly interests, as unnatural; and make such a clatter and din among us with the natural rights and liberties of mankind. I am almost old enough to

further from the old English principles of virtue and religion. From that day to this we have waxed still worse and worse, &c.," p. 8. Besides the works noticed already, and other anonymous ones, which will be referred to afterwards, it contains extracts from a pamphlet "On the unreasonableness of making and imposing Creeds," published 1706, which speaks of the Apostles' Creed as doubtful; from the Rights of the Christian Church; and the writings of Edmund Hickeringill, rector of All Saints', Colchester, who had been presented by the lower house of convocation in their letter concerning books and writings in 1705, and of whom the supposition of his friends was most charitable "who pleaded madness in his behalf."]

[1] [Blount, who had committed suicide in 1693; see note e.]

write an history of the rise and progress of latitude, were it worth the while, in my own time[m]; and I have now lived so

[m] [Hickes was born in 1642. The school of Latitudinarian divines soon after arose at Cambridge. The originators of it were Whichcote, Cudworth, Wilkins, and More. Of these Whichcote seems to have been most influential; he was fellow of King's college and an esteemed tutor, many of his pupils, as Wallis, John Smith, Worthington, and Cradock, becoming distinguished men. On being ordained by Williams, bishop of Lincoln, in 1636, he began an afternoon lecture at Trinity church. In 1643 he went to a living and married, but soon after accepted the provostship of King's from the parliament, and resumed his afternoon lecture, with the view of preserving and propagating "a spirit of sober piety and rational religion" in the University; the effect of his preaching appeared among the divines who rose after the Restoration, of whom most of those who had been educated at Cambridge, among them Tillotson, were formed at least, if not actually brought up by him. To quote Bishop Burnet's words, "He was much for liberty of conscience, and being disgusted with the dry systematical way of those times, he studied to raise those who conversed with him to a nobler set of thoughts. In order to this he set young students much on reading the ancient philosophers, chiefly Plato, Tully, and Plotinus; and on considering the Christian religion as a doctrine sent from God both to elevate and sweeten human nature..... Cudworth carried this out with a great strength of genius and a vast compass of learning. . . . . Wilkins was of Oxford, but removed to Cambridge .. where . . he joined with those who studied to propagate better thoughts, to take men off from being in parties, or from narrow notions, from superstitious conceits, and a fierceness about opinions."

"This set of men studied to assert and examine the principles of religion and morality on clear grounds, and in a philosophical method. In this More, who was an open-hearted and sincere Christian philosopher, led the way. Worthington was a man of eminent piety and great humility, and practised a most sublime way of self-denial and devotion. All these, and those who were formed under them, studied to examine farther into the nature of things than had been done formerly. They declared against superstition on the one hand, and enthusiasm on the other. . . . . They continued to keep up a good correspondence with those who differed from them in opinion, and allowed a great freedom both in philosophy and in divinity, from whence they were called men of latitude, or 'Latitudinarians.' They read Episcopius much." [See Bull's Judicium Eccl. Cath., Works, vol. vi.] "And the making out the reasons of things being a main part of their studies, their enemies called them Socinians. They were all very zealous against popery, and so, they becoming soon very considerable, the papists set themselves to decry them as atheists, deists, or at best Socinians."—Burnet's Own Times, vol. i. pp. 186, seqq.

Bp. Burnet, as is well known, took a very favourable view of this school of divines. On the other hand, Hickes and his friends uniformly maintained, that the heretical and sceptical spirit which was now prevailing, was the legitimate and necessary issue of the latitude of opinion allowed by them; and that it had been evidenced to be so in the known unsound views of some of its leading teachers on most important doctrines. And it must be added, that the deists themselves professed only to carry out the principles of the Platonizing divines. For instance, a Selection of Whichcote's Sermons was published with a preface, by Lord Shaftesbury in 1698. Tindal, Toland, and Collins, speak in the most favourable terms of the clergy of this school, and profess to maintain, in common with them, an opposition to all human authority in matters of faith. Tillotson's Sermons are commended by Sir Robert Howard, in the preface to the "History of Religion," because of the (alleged) absence of doctrine; and Collins, in his Discourse of Freethinking, (1713,) p. 135, speaks of that archbishop as the person "whom all English free-thinkers acknowledge as their head." For further evidence that the deists at this time sheltered themselves under the profession of Latitudinarianism, see note p, p. 72.]

LETTER TO AUTHOR OF RIGHTS.

long, as to see the comble of it in almost an utter waste of all principles; latitude, the source of all mischief, having scarce left any one principle, but this, that there is no principle, nor any creed, but that one article creed, which I have been told, one libertine said was the creed of your club, viz. "I believe all that I can."

These, Sir, as we find from your book, are the men who hate the clergy above all mortals, and therefore love to dress them up in the bearskins of terrible and odious names, to make them frightful and hateful to the people. These are the men whose oracle you are, and whose party-language you speak, calling us, as you think very finely, High Church, high-flyers[n], and enslavers of mankind. But Sir, to let you and your party see how little I am concerned at those names, let me tell you that I glory in them, and here make no difficulty to profess to be all that they truly import. I am for the height, as well as the breadth, and length, and depth of the Church, that is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone. I am as much for the highest pinnacle of it as any other part, though it may be you would throw me down headlong from it if you could, as the Jews did St. James from the battlements of their temple. I also profess to be a high-flyer, whose endeavour is to fly upon the wings of the old principles, which you ridicule, as upon the wings of angels, to my Saviour, to the general assembly, to the Church (the High Church) of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven, and to the spirits of just men made perfect. And as to the last and most hateful name, you will find by my answer, I am, as I long have been, one of those whom you miscall enslavers of mankind, by those strict, holy and primitive doctrines, with which He that made us hath been pleased to limit the passions and actions of men, and to restrain the lusts and liberties of flesh and blood.

You see, Sir, I have made a frank confession to you, and therefore you ought not to reproach me or be angry with me for my error, if it be my unhappy error. First, because I confess it; and secondly, because I have enslaved myself by the narrow rigid doctrines of it, as much as I have en-

[n] [The cant name for the High Church party.]

deavoured to enslave all other men. Sir, I farther protest to you, that as my flesh and blood is of the same nature with yours, so I have had, and still have, as natural desires to be as much at liberty from the severe and sturdy old principles as you. Nay I will farther confess to you and all the world, that my first notions, for want of knowing better, had too much of latitude in them[o]; and that since I espoused the principles I now defend, "the law in my members," as the Apostle calls the inclinations of flesh and blood, would have me throw them off, as so many manacles and fetters; but "the law of my mind," which I take to be superior, will not let me do it, but commands me to go through the strait gate, and walk in the narrow way to heaven. This, Sir, is my unfeigned endeavour, upon conviction which I cannot overcome; this is my profession, which I must still own, and, if you will have it so, my craft, my very priestcraft, by which I am not yet ashamed to declare, I have, as much as I was able, endeavoured in your sense to enslave mankind and deceive the people; but which in my own judgment is to set men free from sin, which heathen as well as Christian writers have always declared to be the greatest slavery of mankind. Pity me therefore, Sir, and all high-flyers as a sort of poor hide-bound[p] mortals, that perhaps (by complexion, or education, or I know not what other evil fate) are made for slavery, rather than abuse us. Methinks men of your large souls should have more humanity, more compassion for us wretched narrow-souled men, than to expose us, as you have done throughout your book, to be baited by the people, who, if they could

[o] [In a letter to Dr. Turner, president of Corpus Christi college, May 13, 1707, given in the note to Hickes' Life in the General Dictionary, he says, "I freely own that when I was in France thirty-four years ago I went to Charenton, and once there received the Sacrament, and afterwards at Blois; but when I came to Montpelier I declined the Sacrament, having, by reading and conferring about the mission of the French Protestant ministers, altered my opinion, I should have said my Irenicum opinion," (that is Latitudinarian, the name being derived from Stillingfleet's work,) "for I had no other than Irenicum principles when I went into France, having not read so much as St. Ignatius' Epistles, or any other father."]

[p] [This expression occurs in "A Brief Account of the new Sect of Latitude men: together with some reflections upon the new Philosophy, by S. P. of Cambridge to his friend G. B. at Oxford, 1662;" he says, "in opposition to that hide-bound, strait-laced spirit that did then prevail, they were called Latitude men," p. 501, as reprinted in the Phœnix, vol. ii. London, 1708. The account is very favourable to the Latitudinarians, the writer supposing them at that time to be essentially orthodox.]

LETTER TO AUTHOR OF RIGHTS.

believe the high Church clergy to be such as you have represented them to be, must needs say of them, as the Jews said of St. Paul, "away with these fellows from the earth, for it is not fit that they should live." Sir, I now take leave of you, not only with as much respect as the Church of England can, but any other Church since the Apostles' time, had you written your book in it, possibly could have had for you; with as much respect as your father[q], were he living, could have for you; with as much respect as the most famous University where you were bred, and the flourishing college in which you have eat so much founder's bread, can have for you: in short, Sir, I take leave of you with as much respect as my high Church principles will suffer me to give you, and with all that respect subscribe myself,

your most faithful friend and servant,

GEORGE HICKES.

[q] [See note, p. 48.]

A

PREFATORY DISCOURSE

IN

ANSWER TO THE RIGHTS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

SECT. I. INTROD. AND PROPOS.

SOME years since I happened to be in the country, where a worthy lady[a] did me the honour to invite me to her house, and to make some stay there[b]. I had been little more than a day with her, when I perceived what a venerable prelate had told me of her some years before, that she was a person of great memory, clear understanding, penetrating judgment, and much reading; and that particularly she was perfect mistress of the controversy between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, having thoroughly ex-

[a] Of whom see an account in p. viii. of my Preface to the second Collection of Controversial Letters relating to the Church of England, and the Church of Rome; printed for Richard Sare at Gray's Inn Gate in Holborn, 1710. [It is there said that this lady was "Mrs. Susanna Hopton, relict of Richard Hopton of Kington in Herefordshire, Esq., one of the Welsh judges in the reigns of King Charles II., and King James II. . . . She fell sick of a very sharp fever at the latter end of June last (1708), which she bore with uncommon courage, patience, and resignation, and died of it in the faith and communion of the Church of England, and constant to her principles, at Hereford, in the eighty-second year of her age, on the 12th day of July following. . . . That excellent book of devotions without her name, entitled 'Daily Devotions, consisting of Thanksgivings, (confessions, and Prayers,) by an (humble) Penitent,' (12mo. 1673,) was her collection and composition." —Ibid., p. x. She also 'reformed' some Roman Catholic works of devotion, to which Dr. Hickes added a few prayers, and published it with the title, "Devotions in the Ancient way of offices, &c., for every day of the week and every holiday in the year, to which are added, occasional offices, and other devotions in the same ancient way. Reformed by a person of quality, and published by George Hickes, D.D." In the preface to the editions sent out after her death he mentions her as the 'reformer,' being up to that time 'obliged to silence.' It is the book commonly known as Hickes' Devotions. Preface to 4th edit. 1712.

"Mrs. Hopton" is added as a MS. note in the margin of Hickes' copy of this work.]

[b] [The date of this visit was about 1695, as appears from the Preface, &c., referred to in the last note; where he says, "she let me copy her letter (see note d) fourteen years ago, at her own house." The preface was written early in 1709.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE. SECT. I.

amined it in almost all the books that had been written on both sides in her mother tongue. In her younger years, living among Roman Catholics, she was perverted by them about the time of the king's martyrdom, and continued some years in their communion, but not without doubts and dissatisfactions, which daily increasing both in number and degree, she confessed them to the priests, particularly to the famous father Turbeville[c]; from whom not receiving satisfaction, she returned to her mother, the Church of England, and like Mr. Chillingworth, was still the more able to defend herself against them, for having been one of them. She wrote her reasons for which she left their communion, in a very civil letter to the father above mentioned; but he never returned any answer to it; the force of it was too great for a reply to such a judgment and understanding as hers, who had a clear view of the controversy; and as she did me the honour to impart a copy of that letter[d] to me in her own writing, so at my request she let me transcribe it, which I did with much satisfaction and delight.

As we talked of things relating to this controversy, she told me she thought nothing was so needful to the understanding of it, or any other controversies which the Church of England had with any of her adversaries, as to have a right and complete notion of the Church; all disputes about religion, as she observed, being about the doctrine, or government, or worship of the Church. And though I hope, said she, the notions I have of it are true, yet I doubt whether I

[c] [The person alluded to is Henry Turbeville, a jesuit priest educated at Douay, where he was afterwards professor, and an eminent controversialist. "He was a person in his time of great note and authority among those of his communion in England." During the civil wars he was chaplain to the marquis of Worcester and to Sir George Blount. He wrote a work called "A manual of controversies, clearly demonstrating the truth of Catholic Religion," Douay, 1654, which was replied to by Hammond, Tombes the Baptist, and Dr. William Thomas, bishop of Worcester; and was the author of the Douay Catechism, a work of considerable repute among Roman Catholics; the title being "An abridgement of Christian Doctrine, Catechistically explained by way of question and answer, 1676." (See Dodd's Church History, vol. iii. p. 302. 1742.)

In the first edition the words were "Father Hudleston." He was "the priest that had a great hand in saving the king (Charles II.)'s life at Worcester fight," who was afterwards chaplain to Queen Catherine, and sent for to administer the last Sacraments of the Roman Church to the king. (Dodd's Church History, ibid., p. 490. Burnet's Own Times, vol. i. p. 607. fol.) Mrs. Hopton knew father Hudleston very well, and they had spoken of him on this occasion. Preface, &c., p. xii.]

[d] That letter is printed in the Collection of Controversial Letters above cited in the margin. [pp. 118—152.]

have all the notions that belong to it. For when I exercise my thoughts about it, methinks I find something defective in my conceptions of it, though I cannot tell what it is.

I perceived by a little more discourse with her, that by the notion of a Church, she meant the notion of it as a society, and that it would be useful and grateful to her to help her to range the conceptions she had of it as such; for I suspected that though they were all true, yet they might be imperfect, and perhaps a little confused. I therefore took the liberty to ask her some questions relating to that subject in a mathematical sort of method, in which every following question was always a consequent of that which was asked before. She presently perceived my design, and was much pleased with the order in which I propounded my questions; and I found by her answers to them, that she wanted nothing requisite to a complete idea of the Church, as a spiritual society, but a more clear understanding of the collegiate government of it by bishops, and that Christ had committed the charge and care of it in whole as well as in part, jointly as well as separately, to all the bishops as His vice-gerents; and that by consequence not only the bishops of every province, but of the whole Catholic Church, were fellows and colleagues. She discovered much satisfaction in being made mistress of this notion, which, she said, increased her admiration of the wisdom of God in the constitution of His Church, and in securing the Christian priesthood by such a constitution; and helped her to apprehend some things better than she did before, as how much this co-ordinate union of it depended on the unity of the episcopal college; that its union with the state in all countries was only social and federal, and not an incorporating union; and also that the pope's supremacy was a most groundless pretension, and a monstrous and intolerable usurpation over the Catholic Church.

Our conference being ended, she desired me to turn my questions and the discourses incident to them into propositions; which I did after some time, and waited upon her with them. It happened that I found a very pious and worthy gentleman, a serjeant-at-law[e], at her house, to whose

[e] [The serjeant-at-law was Mr. T. Geers, brother to Mrs. Hopton. See Gen. Dict., note to article on Hickes.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE. SECT. I.

care and protection her husband had left her upon his death-bed, as to a most honest gentleman, skilful lawyer, and faithful friend. She desired me to let her shew him my propositions, to which I readily consented; and he, after he had read them, with great civility natural to him, desired the freedom to object against them; but I told him I would first send him, in a letter, a more complete copy of them to read again, with notes, and then upon second thoughts, he might return them to me with his objections in writing; which he shortly after did in a letter, to which the second letter[f] in the following book was my answer. But to my great grief, and the grief of all who knew the very worthy man, he died before I could get it transcribed[g].

[f] [This is the Second Discourse, "On the Dignity of the Episcopal Order." The objections as there stated were, 1. (chap. i. § 1,) to the "speaking of bishops as 'spiritual princes,' and their dioceses as 'spiritual principalities.'" 2. (chap. ii. § 1.) "That the doctrine contained in the propositions was like that of the presbyterians concerning Church power and independency, by which they had endeavoured to enslave the State to the Church."]

[g] [A more full account of this correspondence, and the letters which passed, together with some others, appeared after Dr. Hickes' death, under the title "The Constitution of the Catholic Church and the nature and consequences of Schism, set forth in a collection of papers written by the late right reverend George Hickes, D.D. He being dead yet speaketh, (Heb. xi. 4;) of whom the world was not worthy, (ver. 38.)" 1716.

Their conference at Mrs. Hopton's house "occasioned the serjeant to send him a query (p. 1.) concerning communicating with a Church which prays for an usurper; this query he answered" (pp. 2—14;) apparently this query and answer were sent through Mrs. Hopton; "the serjeant replied in a letter" to Hickes, (pp. 15—21.) "and our author sent a rejoinder," (pp. 21—60.) "In this rejoinder the reader will find a few (twenty-three) propositions relating to the Church as a society; which when the author had read over again, and had with deliberation reflected upon them, he thought with himself that he could improve the scheme which he had there laid down: accordingly he enlarged the substance of every proposition, and augmented the number to forty. These propositions thus enlarged he sent to his correspondent... with a letter".. The Publisher to the Reader, pp. iv, v.

The four propositions, which alone are mentioned here, are the first four of the forty, the rest belong to the questions of particular Churches, of schism, and of the relation of the Church to the civil powers.

The serjeant "returned them with some objections; in answer to which objections the author of the propositions wrote a vindication of them, and divided it into four parts, the two first of which were printed under the title of 'A Discourse concerning the dignity of the Episcopal order;' and the two last are as follow," &c. (Ibid., p. 130.)

The other objections of the serjeant, besides those given in note f, were to the later propositions. First, "that they are very severe, as involving the whole nation, except a very small number of the clergy and laity, in a dreadful schism." (Ibid., p. 131.) Secondly, "The small number of the deprived bishops whose places are filled with others that profess the same faith." (Ibid., p. 142.) And lastly, "that the propositions are dangerous, as being against law, and the legislative power as practised in this kingdom."

"The propositions were printed at the end of a book entitled 'The character of a primitive bishop,' but that copy was imperfect and unfinished." Ibid., p. vii. The General Dictionary,

INTRODUCTION.

After I had got a fair copy, I gave a learned divine an account of it, who thereupon was desirous to read it and the propositions I sent him with it[h]. I told him I would consent to his desire, if he would promise to read them as an adversary, because he could not otherwise read them as a friend; and when he had read them, he sent them to me with an objection, which he said would be made against my fourth proposition; an objection indeed somewhat surprising, which in the beginning of my first letter[i], that is my answer to it, I have recited in his own words.

I am sensible I ought to beg the reader's pardon, for so long an account of the occasions of writing those two letters, and I hope to obtain it, because I could not well give a shorter account, with due respect to my friends, if I gave any at all.

I must farther acquaint the reader, that as the objection mentioned in the beginning of the first letter was made against my fourth proposition, so the objection mentioned in the beginning of the second letter, was made against the third.

This, I think, obliges me to present them here to public view, with the first and second propositions, without the attendance of which I think they would neither be so orderly nor so decently introduced, nor perhaps be so satisfactory to the reader.

THE PROPOSITIONS.

PROPOSITIONS.

I. To understand the constitution of the Catholic Church as a society, it will be requisite to observe by what names it

as quoted above, adds, "Two years before he died, or thereabouts, the Dean (Hickes) reviewed these letters, and made several alterations in them . . . which is the reason of the difference between them, as here printed, and the copy of them, which Dr. Nathaniel Marshall, who endeavoured to answer them, had the use of."

It will be observed that Hickes suppresses all reference to those parts of the propositions which belonged to the nonjuring question, nor does he allude here to the existence of any other than the first four; though he does incidentally imply it elsewhere, as in the Christian Priesthood, chap. i. sect. 1.]

[h] [In "The Constitution, &c.," quoted in the last note, it is said that the propositions were shewn to this learned divine, before they were sent to the serjeant.]

[i] [i. e. The first Discourse, "The Christian Priesthood asserted." The objection which it was said would be brought, (see that Discourse, chap. i. sect. 1,) was, "that he had not proved from Scripture that the ministers of the Church were Priests; and that in the whole New Testament they are not once called Priests, nor their ministry Priesthood."]

is set forth in the Scriptures, where it is called 'the kingdom of God[k],' and 'dominion of Christ[l],' 'the city of God[m],' 'the house and household of God[n];' and because this house of God is an holy house, in which He is especially present, it is therefore compared to a 'temple[o],' wherein He is worshipped by priests and people. It is also called 'the polity[p],' which we translate 'the commonwealth of Israel,' and 'the body of Christ[q],' to signify that it is a spiritual society or incorporation, of which Christ is the head, and all particular Churches are members.

II. It is to be considered, that this kingdom, dominion, city, spiritual house[r], body, and polity of Christ, had a being in the world under its own magistrates[s] and rulers, independent on the secular powers three hundred years together, before the empire became Christian; and after that in the reigns of apostate and heretical emperors who persecuted the Church.

III. Christ the archetypal, eternal Melchisedec, is the King

[k] Matt. iv. 23; x. 7; xvi. 28; xxi. 43; Mark i. 14; Luke i. 32, 33; viii. 1; xxi. 31; Acts i. 3; viii. 12; xx. 25; xxviii. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 24; Col. i. 13.

[l] Dan. ii. 44; vii. 14, 27; Heb. i. 8; ii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 15; Rev. xvii. 14; xix. 16; Acts ii. 34, 36; Rom. xiv. 9; Phil. ii. 9—11.

[m] Heb. xii. 22; [Rev.] iii. 12; Gal. iv. 25, 26; Ephes. ii. 19.

[n] Heb. iii. 1—6; Ephes. ii. 19; 1 Tim. iii. 15; 1 Pet. ii. 5; iv. 17.

[o] 1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 21, 22.

[p] Eph. ii. 12.

[q] Eph. i. 22, 23; iv. 12, 15; v. 23, 30; Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 27; Col. i. 18, 24. 'Corpus sumus de conscientia religionis et disciplinæ unitate [et spei fœdere.']—Tertull. Apol. c. 39. [p. 31, A.] 'Semel dixerim, una Ecclesia sumus. Ita nostrum est, quodcunque nostrorum est, ceterum dividis corpus.'—Id., de Virgin. Veland. c. 2. [p. 173, D.] 'Sed nec Ecclesiam defendere [possunt] qui quando, et quibus incunabulis institutum est hoc corpus, probare non habent.'—Id., de Præscript. c. 22. [p. 209, D.]

[r] 1 Pet. ii. 5. "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house." 'Eos esse Ecclesiam qui in domo De permanent.'—S. Cypr. ed. Oxon. Epist. lix. [Ep. lv. ad Cornelium, p. 83. ed. Ben.] 'Quo sacramento [i. e. Raab, quæ typum ecclesiæ gerebat,] declaratur in unam domum solam, id est, in Ecclesiam, victuros et ab interitu mundi evasuros, colligi oportere.... Non habitans in domo Dei, id est, in Ecclesia Dei.'—Id. Epist. lxix. [Ep. lxxvi. ad Magnum, p. 153.] Hence our Church in her Liturgy (fifth Sunday after Epiph.) "O Lord, we beseech Thee to keep Thy Church and household continually in Thy true religion." And (twenty-second Sunday after Trin.) "Lord, we beseech Thee to keep Thy household the Church in continual godliness."

[s] Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18; John xx. 23; 1 Cor. v. 4, 5; Mark xvi. 15, 20; Matt. xxviii. 18—20; Luke xxiv. 49; Matt. x. 16; 1 Cor. i. 1; Rom. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Gal. i. 1, 11, 12; Acts xx. 28; Heb. v. 4, 5; 2 Chron. xxvi. 18; Matt. x. 40; Luke x. 16; John xiii. 20; Heb. xiii. 7, 17; 1 Cor. v. 12; 1 Thess. v. 12; Acts iv. 19; v. 29; xvii. 7; Luke xxiii. 2; 1 Cor. iv. 21; [2 Cor.] x. 2; xiii. 10; 1 Tim. v. 1, 20; 2 Tim. iv. 2; Tit. i. 13; ii. 15; Rev. ii. 14, 20.

of this spiritual kingdom[t], Lord of this spiritual dominion, and supreme Head of this spiritual corporation, and the bishops[u], as successors to the Apostles[u], are under Him, by commission derived from Him, spiritual lords[u], chiefs, and

[t] *οὗτος [ὁ γνωστικὸς] ἄρα ὄντως ὁ βασιλικὸς ἄνθρωπος· οὗτος ἱερεὺς ὅσιος τοῦ Θεοῦ· ὅπερ ἔτι καὶ νῦν παρὰ τοῖς λογιωτάτοις τῶν βαρβάρων σώζεται, τὸ ἱερατικὸν γένος εἰς βασιλείαν προσαγόντων.*—S. Clem. Alex. Strom., lib. vii. p. 720. [Paris. 1629. lib. vii. c. 7. Op., tom. ii. p. 852. Oxon. 1715.] "Therefore this man who is truly king, he is the holy priest of God; in like manner as even now among the most polished of the barbarous nations, who take their kings from among their priests."

[u] *Οἱ Ἀπόστολοι κ.τ.λ.* Apostoli nobis a Christo evangelizaverunt, Jesus Christus a Deo. Missus enim est Christus a Deo, et Apostoli a Christo, et factum est utrumque ordinate ex voluntate ejus. Mandatum quippe accipientes, et per resurrectionem Domini nostri Jesu Christi plena certitudine imbuti, Deique verbo confirmati cum Spiritus Sancti fiducia egressi sunt, evangelizantes regni Dei adventum. Per regiones et urbes, regnum Dei prædicantes, primitias (suæ prædicationis ad fidem conversas) spiritu suo probantes, Episcopos, et Ministros eorum qui crederent erant, constituerunt. —S. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Cor i. [cap.] xlii. *[οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῖν εὐαγγελίσθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἐξεπέμφθη ὁ Χριστὸς οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἐγένοντο οὖν ἀμφότερα εὐτάκτως ἐκ θελήματος Θεοῦ. Παραγγελίας οὖν λαβόντες, καὶ πληροφορηθέντες διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πιστωθέντες τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ μετὰ πληροφορίας πνεύματος ἁγίου, ἐξῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ μέλλειν ἔρχεσθαι. Κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες, καθίστασαν τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν.*— Patr. Ap., tom. i. p. 171.] Apostoli nostri per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum cognoscentes contentionem de nomine Episcopatus oborituram, eam ob causam perfecta scientia præditi, prædictos (i.e. primitias suæ prædicationis, seú primogenitos in Christo) constituerunt, et deinceps futuræ successionis regulam tradiderunt, ut cum il'i mortui essent, alii viri probati ministerium eorum acciperent.—[ibid.] c. xliv. *[καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς· διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομὴν δεδώκασιν ὅπως ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν.* — Ibid. p. 173.] This testimony of St. Clement, a fellow-labourer with the Apostles, agrees exactly with the Scriptures, Acts vi. 6. "Whom they set before the Apostles: and when they had prayed they laid their hands on them." xiv. 23. "And when they had ordained them elders in every Church." Tit. i. 5. "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set things in order, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." 1 Tim. iv. 14. "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." v. 22. "Lay hands suddenly on no man." 2 Tim. i. 6. "I put thee in remembrance thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the imposition of my hands." [Habemus annumerare eos qui] ab Apostolis instituti sunt episcopi [in ecclesiis], et successores eorum usque ad nos.—S. Iren. contra Hæreses, lib. iii. c. 3. [§ 1. p. 175.] Edant [ergo] origines Ecclesiarum suarum: evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum Apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem.—Tertull. De Præsc. Hæret., c. xxxii. [Op., p. 213, B.] Meminisse autem diaconi debent, quoniam Apostolos, id est, episcopos et præpositos Dominus elegit: diaconos autem post ascensum Domini in cœlos Apostoli sibi constituerunt episcopatus sui et Ecclesiæ ministros.—S. Cypr. Epist. iii. [ad Rogatianum, Epist. lxv. Op., p. 113. ed. Ben.] [Hoc vel maxime frater et laboramus et laborare debemus] ut unitatem a Domino, et per Apostolos nobis successoribus tradi-

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. II.

princes, as well as priests in His spiritual kingdom; to whom, in their respective spiritual dominions and jurisdictions, He requires obedience of all His subjects, of what temporal rank or condition soever, as to His stewards, vicegerents, or chief ministers over His Church.

IV. That the Church, or incorporate body of Christians, is by its constitution a holy[x], royal, or regal priesthood[y], as it is called in the Scriptures. First, because Christ the head of it, is the antitype of Melchisedec, and as such, a sacerdotal sovereign, or regal priest. And secondly, because this sacerdotal Sovereign has committed the government and administration of His kingdom to ministerial priests, who, as I must often put you in mind, are the vicars[z], substitutes, legates, representatives, or vicegerents of their royal, sacerdotal, Lord and Master, in His kingly, as well as His priestly office, throughout all the districts and dominions of His spiritual kingdom upon earth.

tam, quantum possumus, obtinere curemus.—Id. Epist. xlv. [ad Cornelium. Epist. xlii. Op., p. 57. ed. Ben.] Potestas ergo peccatorum remittendorum Apostolis data est, et Ecclesiis quas illi a Christo missi constituerunt, et episcopis qui eis ordinatione vicaria successerunt.—Ibid. Epist. lxxv. Firmiliani Cypriano. [Op., p. 148. ed. Ben.] Inde per temporum et successionum vices, Episcoporum ordinatio, et Ecclesiæ ratio decurrit, ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constituatur: et omnis actus Ecclesiæ per eosdem præpositos gubernetur. Cum hoc itaque divina lege fundatum sit, &c.—S. Cypr. Epist. xxxiii. [ad Lapsos. Epist. xxvii. Op., pp. 37, 38. ed. Ben.] Quamobrem frater, si majestatem Dei, qui sacerdotes ordinat, cogitaveris: [si Christum,] qui arbitrio, et nutu, ac præsentia sua et præpositos ipsos, et Ecclesiam cum præpositis gubernat, [aliquando respexeris;] &c.—Id. Epist. lxvi. [ad Florentium. Epist. lxix. Op., p. 124. ed. Ben.] Nec hæc jacto, sed dolens profero, cum te judicem Dei constituas et Christi, qui dicit ad Apostolos, ac per hoc ad omnes præpositos, qui Apostolis vicaria ordinatione succedunt: *Qui audit vos me audit*... ecce jam sex annis nec fraternitas habuerit Episcopum, nec plebs præpositum, [nec grex pastorem,] nec Ecclesia gubernatorem, nec Christus antistitem, nec Deus sacerdotem.—Id. Epist. lxvi. [Epist. lxix. Op., p. 122. ed. Ben.]

[x] 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9. "Ye ... are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood.... But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood," or, 'kingdom of priests.' Exod. xix. 6.

[y] S. Greg. Naz., Orat. xxx. in consecratione Eulalii Doarensium Episcopi. "But thou shalt receive a more perfect armour from greater generals, by which thou mayest be able to quench the fiery darts of the devil, and present unto the Lord a peculiar people, a holy nation, a regal priesthood in Christ Jesus the Lord, to whom be glory for ever. Amen." [*τὴν μὲν οὖν τελεωτέραν ὅπλισιν δέχοιο παρὰ τῶν μειζόνων στρατηγῶν, δι' ἧς δυνήσῃ τὰ βέλη τοῦ πονηροῦ τὰ πεπυρωμένα σβέσαι, καὶ παραστῆσαι τῷ Κυρίῳ λαὸν περιούσιον, ἔθνος ἅγιον, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.*—S. Greg. Nazian. Oratio xiii. tom. i. p. 255, B.]

[z] Neque enim aliunde hæreses obortæ sunt, aut nata [sunt] schismata, quam inde quod sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos, et [ad tempus] judex *vice Christi* cogitatur.—S. Cypr. Epist. lix. [ad Cornelium. Epist. lv. Op., p. 82. ed. Ben.]

REAL VIEWS OF AUTHOR, &c.

Real views of the Author of the Rights, and his party.

After telling the occasion of writing these two letters, it will be expected I should give an account of the publishing of them, to which I was provoked by a late book falsely entitled, "The Rights of the Christian Church:" in which the author, with all the art he was master of, and with more spite and insolence than Julian or any other apostate did, hath written without any true force of argument, or making any distinction of priests, against the whole Christian priesthood, and against the Christian Church and its true constitution and rights. Whether the Christian Church is one body, or several independent bodies throughout the whole world; and if one body, whether it is, or is not, distinct from the State, and independent of it in all places; and whether the administration of it was not by Divine appointment committed to bishops, as successors of the Apostles, who are to govern it by continued succession from one to another; and whether they, as supreme governors of it, have not authority to admit into and exclude people of all ranks out of it, are all questions of fact, which are to be determined by the Scriptures, and the consentient doctrine and practice of the Catholic Church, consisting both of priests and people; of which, I hope, I have given a plain and sufficient account, especially in the second letter. And the reader is to be judge, whether the reasonings of this author (who hath licked up the venom of Hobbes, Selden[a], Spinoza, and Marvel, and disgorged it upon the Church) can be of any force against the testimony of such a cloud of witnesses, against the joint authority of so many holy saints and martyrs, even of all Christianity from the time of the Apostles; and whether it was not most absurd in him to argue against facts so proved, and a constitution so universally admitted, and received for Divine in all places, as if all Christians hitherto had been deluded, or as if there neither were, nor could be any such constitution, which in

[a] Both which are thoroughly confuted in 116 small octavo pages of the first part of a book entituled "The Case of the Church of England, [briefly and truly stated, in the three first and fundamental principles of a Christian Church,] by S. P. London 1681." [Part. I. The Obligation of Christianity, by Divine Right.] And in those few pages the reader will find a full answer to the "Rights of the Christian Church." [The author of this work was Dr. Samuel Parker, who became bishop of Oxford under James II., 1686, and by royal mandate president of Magdalene college.]

his false reasoning he misrepresents, as "absurd," "uncharitable[b]," "inconsistent with reason and the ends of ecclesiastical discipline[c]," "an obstacle to the spreading of the gospel[d]," "destructive of itself and the interests of the Christian religion[e]," and "of infinite mischief to the Christian world, and human societies[f]."

These are charges which were never laid upon the constitution of the Church in the first and earliest ages of Christianity, which had the best means of understanding the constitution of it, as living nearest the times of its original. The Christians of those ages, to which I confine my enquiry in the second letter, had as great men among them as ever lived since, and much greater and more celebrated civilians[g] than the reputed author of the Rights; and yet they were so blind as not to see the monstrous faults and defects in the building and economy of Christ's house, and the polity of His kingdom, which this man hath spied in it; or if they did, they were such ill-natured Timons of human kind as not to discover them betimes, to undeceive the deluded world, for the interests of the Christian religion and the good of mankind. This discovery, it seems, was reserved for this blessed age, and for this incomparable book. In which, supposing the constitution of the Church to be such in fact as ancient Christianity in all places believed and took it to be, then the author hath charged God, the founder and architect of it, with all the faults and flaws he pretends to find in its fabric and constitution, highly blaspheming His infinite wisdom and goodness, in foolishly forming a polity and government, so 'absurd in its nature, so destructive to itself, and so inconsistent with the great ends for which it was framed, the propagation of Christianity, and the good of the world.' At this bold and most impious way of writing, he may make another such golden book, if he pleases, against the Jewish Church and priesthood, of which I do not doubt but he hath the same worthy thoughts, with his master

[b] [Rights, &c. chap. iii. p. 88.]
[c] [Ibid., chap. iv. p. 122.]
[d] [Ibid., chap. v. p. 180.]
[e] [Ibid., chap. vi. p. 190.]
[f] [Ibid., chap. viii. p. 244. See table of contents and headings of chapters.]

[g] Such as Tribonianus, Theophilus, Dorotheus, &c. [These were the writers of the Institutes, (Just. Inst. Proem., § 93,) and compilers of the Digest and the Justinian Code, A.D. 527, sqq. See Gibbon's Decline and Fall, c. xliv.]

REAL VIEWS OF AUTHOR, &c.

Spinoza[h], as he hath of the Christian, viz., that, like the superstitious institutions of Numa, they were both but pretended revelations, and in reality the inventions of crafty and designing men. Nay at this rate he may write a serious satire against the natural constitution of man, and blasphemously charge his Creator with want of wisdom and goodness, in making a creature subject to two such different and jarring principles and powers, as flesh and spirit, sense and reason, whereof "the one is contrary to the other[i]," and whereby the unhappy creature is "at the same time[k]," as he speaks, "under different obligations," as when one commandeth him to go to church, and the other to lie in bed at home; or the one bids him keep a day holy, and the other bids him work, or the one would have him feast and indulge his genius, but the other would have him fast.

But not to insist longer on the impiety and blasphemy of his undertaking, would you not think a man mad, that would write a book in good earnest, to prove that there cannot be two such contrary principles and contending powers in one and the same creature? That the doctrine of the τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν, is an absurd, uncharitable doctrine, which restrains men from the pleasures for which they were born; that it hath caused infinite vexation and mischief to man-

[h] See a book entituled, "Spinoza Revived, [or, a Treatise, proving the Book, entitled, The Rights of the Christian Church, &c. (in the most notorious parts of it) to be the same with Spinoza's Rights of the Christian Clergy, &c. and that both of them are grounded upon downright Atheism. —To which is added, A Preliminary Discourse relating to the said books, by the Reverend Dr. George Hicks. London,] Printed and to be sold by Jo. Morphew. 1709."

[The work referred to is entitled "Lucii Antistii Constantis de Jure Ecclesiasticorum liber singularis, quo docetur, quodcunque divini humanique juris Ecclesiasticis tribuitur, vel ipsi sibi tribuunt, hoc aut falso impieque ipsis tribui aut non aliunde quam a suis, hoc est, ejus reipublicæ sive civitatis prodiis, in qua sunt constituti, accepisse, Alethopoli, (Amsterdam,) 1665." It was reported to be Spinoza's, and so was attributed to him by Bayle; by others it has been assigned to his disciple Meyer, (Spinozæ Op., Præf. p. xii. Jenæ, 1802,) but in the Biographie Universelle (article Spinoza, p. 327), it is said to be the work of Dominic de la Cour, or Vanden Hoof: where also the work, Spinoza Revived, is attributed to Carroll; see his answer to Locke, pp. 276—280. London, 1706. The same sentiments however are contained in the Tractatus Theolog. Polit. of Spinoza, cap. xix., of which the title is "Ostenditur jus circa sacra penes summas potestates omnino esse, et Religionis cultum externum Reipublicæ paci accommodari debere, si recte Deo obtemperare velimus."]

[i] τὸ σῶμα; . . . ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα; . . . φιλεῖ γὰρ ὡς τὰ πολλὰ ἀντιπολεμεῖν ταῦτα ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἀντικαθέζεσθαι.— S. Greg. Nazian. Orat. viii. [Orat. xii. Op., tom. i. p. 249, A, B. ed. Ben.]

[k] The Rights, [ch. i.] pp. 33—35, edit. 3.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. II.

kind, and that it, and the doctrines of mortification, self-denial, and resignation to the will of any god, are of pagan original, borrowed from heathen priests and philosophers, from the druids in the west, or the brahmins and faquirs in the east, and that it sets the wretched creature at strife with himself, and, by its unnatural severities, is utterly inconsistent with the wisdom and goodness of God, and the true happiness of man?

Would you not, I say, think a man far gone in frenzy, that should set himself to write such a book? And yet our author is that man, as King David was the rich man in Nathan's parable. For he hath written a book against the frame and constitution of the Church in all the parts of it, though it is as certain that God was the maker and contriver of it, if the general voice and testimony of ancient Christianity is to be believed, as that He was the creator of man. I say, the general voice of ancient Christianity; because heretics and schismatics, as well as catholics, bore witness to that very constitution of the Church against which he writes. When they disputed matters of doctrine, they never quarrelled about the episcopal frame of Church government and discipline; and though they were often divided into different parties and communions, yet they were all religious observers of the same Church polity (except Aerius and his few followers) which he attempts to subvert, because they all alike believed it to have been instituted by Christ.

But what need have I to appeal to the testimony of Christianity? What need I produce antiquity, universality, and consent, against an upstart, bold writer, supported by no such authority? The testimonies of the early and learned saints and martyrs, which I have cited above in the margins of the sixth, seventh, and eighth pages[l], for the constitution, rights, and powers of the Church, are abundantly sufficient without any other, to weigh down a thousand such books as this wretched man, or club of men[m], hath written 'in this

[l] [Of the third edition, pp. 64—66 of the present one.]

[m] [See note d, p. 50. Leslie (Vindication, 1710, Works, vol. i. pp. 126, 127.) speaks of the Rights as coming from the deists as a body, and says, "it may well be reckoned among the opposers of the Short and Easy Method, though it proceeds not by way of direct answer to it." See below, note p, p. 72.]

REAL VIEWS OF AUTHOR, &c.

day of trouble, rebuke, and blasphemy, to reproach God.' God, whom he hath charged with folly, in framing a Church polity for Christians, 'most absurd and inconsistent with itself, and the very ends for which it was formed.' Ten thousand such tekels of modern books, if weighed in the balance against Scripture and primitive antiquity, will be found defective and wanting, but as a drop of a bucket, or as a little dust, plainly as nothing in the judgment of serious men who will impartially compare them together.

The deists and atheists of late, by this and other such writers, have 'exalted their voices against the Lord,' and His Church; but, I hope, 'He hath heard their words, and will reprove them, and' in His appointed time 'make the Virgin, the daughter of Zion, whom they despise and laugh to scorn, despise and shake her head at them.' It concerns all good Christians to distinguish themselves from them, and to resist them, as they would the devil, stedfastly in the Christian faith, which it is their design to destroy, if they could, in writing against the priesthood and the Church. For if they can once persuade men, that Church government and discipline is nothing but the invention and craft of priests, they will soon persuade them that the Christian doctrines are so too. And hence it is, that we have so many of their invective pamphlets against making of creeds, and creed-makers, who impose upon men articles of faith[n]. These men of 'large minds' and 'free thoughts,' will not have them confined, and tied up to forms and summaries of belief, but on they will go in the broad way of thinking, as well as living, out-doing the devils in latitude; the devils, who as the Scripture tells us, are such narrow-souled spirits, as to believe and tremble. If they durst, they would write as publicly against Scripture-making, as you may perceive by the table-talk which the reputed author of the Rights, and some other Grecians had of them, at a dinner the 29th of November last[o]. There their tongues were their own, and without any restraint to the 'liberties of mankind,' and the 'freedoms of human nature,' they plentifully vented their blasphemies upon the holy writings, which nothing but the good inten-

[n] [See note k, p. 54.]

[o] That is, the 29th of November before the first edition of this book, [Nov. 29, 1706.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. II.

tion of creating an abhorrence of such monsters of unbelief and blasphemy, can justify the recital of[p]. They began with Balaam and his ass, and with scorn and scurrility enough, asserted the ass to be the fittest of the two 'to see an angel,

[p] [The reason for Hickes' going into the details which follow is to be found in the character of the attacks which were made by the deists of his time on Christianity. The passage quoted (note p. 80) from Lord Shaftesbury's Sensus Communis is a key to the course they adopted. They spoke of themselves as sincere Christians, and conformed to the established religion. "These heretics are suffered to continue in the Church without discrimination . . . nay they are allowed to come, when their interest brings them thither, to the holy altar." (Preliminary Discourse to Spinoza Revived.) They wished to be identified with the schools of Locke and Tillotson. Thus they professed to receive the general facts of Christianity, and the Scriptures as a whole, only objecting to particular portions. They rejected all Church authority, and the imposition of creeds, as interfering with the liberty of private judgment: they denied all mysterious doctrines, or at all events the importance of believing them. They professed a great respect for the Latitudinarian clergy, and that they only objected to the extreme views of the High Church party. They ridiculed the doctrines of the Sacraments and the priesthood, and at the same time by sneers and inuendoes attacked all the doctrines of the gospel, and many of the truths of natural religion. Thus Tindal in the second Defence of the Rights, p. 176, referring to the charge of his "having been a papist," says, "I believe the author of the Rights keeping so exactly to the principles of the Protestant religion, and of the Church of England, in opposition to High Church notions, is the best reason they have for supposing him once a papist; knowing that a shipwrecked person will be careful to avoid the rock on which he formerly split. A man of the most ordinary understanding is in no danger of falling into popery, if he is not debauched in his early education with High Church notions, and University principles, and then a Chillingworth's parts cannot secure him." And in Holland, Le Clerc, speaking of the Rights, &c. says, "We hear that this book has made a great noise in England. . . . I am persuaded that the wise and moderate members of [that] Church can never be alarmed at such a book as this. . . . I believe the author, as himself says, had no design upon the present establishment, but only against some excessive pretensions, which are even contrary to the laws of the land, and to the authority of the king and parliament. . . . They who understand English will do well to read the original; they have never read a book so strong and so supported, in favour of the principles which Protestants on this side the water hold in common." —Bibliotheque Choisée, tom. x. p. 305. 1706. And in the Rehearsal, No. 175, Jan. 18, 1706, we read: "*Countryman.* There is one thing amazes me strangely; that the dissenters generally cry up this book of the Rights. . . . *Rehearsal.* They think this book may be of service against the Church of England." It was also said to have been approved by Mr. Locke. It became necessary to shew the real opinions of the school to which the author belonged; which is done by Dr. Hickes here, and in the Preface to the second edition of the "Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England;" and as respects Tindal himself in the Preliminary Discourse to "Spinoza Revived," in which after printing Archdeacon Proast's letter, (see p. 49. note a,) as to Tindal's professing deistical views, he says, "From this letter it appears what the writer of the Rights and that gang have in petto, and that they are utter unbelievers of all revealed religion, and those among whom they dare use their liberty of speech, know that their conversation is agreeable to this declaration of Dr. Tindal, and answerable to the character I have here and elsewhere given of them: and if ever they see a proper time for it, I doubt not, but they will print their blasphemies, as plainly and as freely as they speak them. Witness some of their late pieces in which they speak out." These anticipations were, as is well known, soon realized. See the notes in the following pages.]

REAL VIEWS OF AUTHOR, &c.

and to have Divine inspirations and revelations.' They said 'the books of the New Testament were a long while kept private, till the council of Laodicea[q] fell to telling of noses[r];' in which their malice exceeded that of Julian, who never questioned the canon of the holy Scriptures. 'Hermas' Pastor they despised, as the most silly book that ever was cited for Scripture by the ancients, with others of the same stamp.' But these scorners might have spoken with more respect of an holy author, whom God employed in so many messages to His Church, and to whom He vouchsafed so many revelations, and for whom so many of the ancients, as Clemens Alexandrinus[s], Origen[t], Irenæus[u], had a great reverence, even for the simplicity of his writings, though they were mistaken in the authority of them; I need not mention St. Athanasius[x], nor the learned men of this age, as Cotelerius[y] and Dr. Bernard[z], who have adorned this book with their notes; nor Du Pin[a], nor Tillemont[b]; nor Dr. Wake,

[q] [In Phrygia Pacatiana, circ. A.D. 364. Canon lx. ὅσα δεῖ βιβλία ἀναγινώσκεσθαι κ. τ. λ. Concil., tom. i. p. 1540, E. 1541, A, B.]

[r] [See Hobbes' Leviathan, part iii. chap. 33. pp. 203, 204. 1651, and Leland's Deist. Writers, vol. i. p. 58. London, 1754. "He (Hobbes) insinuates that the copies of the Scriptures were but few, and only in the hands of ecclesiastics. . . . That they were not received as of Divine authority in the Christian Church till they were declared to be so in the council of Laodicea, A.D. 365;" and speaking of Toland's Amyntor, published 1698, Leland says, (ibid., p. 81,) "He hath there raked together whatever he could find relating to the spurious gospels, and pretended sacred books which appeared in the early ages of the Christian . . . his design in all this manifestly is to shew that the gospels and other sacred writings now acknowledged as canonical, really deserve no greater credit than those works, &c."]

[s] [e. g. θείως τοίνυν ἡ δύναμις ἡ τῷ Ἑρμᾷ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν λαλοῦσα, κ. τ. λ. —Clem. Alex. Strom., lib. i. c. 29. Op., p. 426.]

[t] [e. g. Puto tamen quod Hermas iste sit scriptor libelli illius qui Pastor appellatur, quæ Scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur, et ut puto divinitus inspirata.—Origen. Comment. in Epist. ad Rom., lib. x. c. 31. Op., tom. iv. p. 683, A. col. 2.]

[u] [e. g. Bene ergo pronuntiavit Scriptura, quæ dicit: (S. Hermæ Pastor., lib. ii. Mand. 1. Patr. Ap., tom. i. p. 85.) 'Primo omnium crede quoniam unus est Deus, qui omnia constituit, et consummavit; et fecit ex eo quod non erat, ut essent omnia: omnium capax, et qui a nemine capiatur.' S. Irenæus contra Hæreses, lib. iv. c. 20. (al. c. 37.) Op., p. 253. col. 1. See 'Veterum Testimonia de S. Hermæ Pastore' (Cotelerii Patr. Apost., tom. i. p. 70.) where many other passages are quoted. See also Bull's Def. F. N. sect. i. cap. ii. § 3.]

[x] [. . . ἐστὶ καὶ ἕτερα βιβλία τούτων ἔξωθεν· οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν, τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις καὶ βουλομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον· σοφία Σολομῶντος, καὶ σοφία Σιρὰχ, καὶ Ἐσθὴρ, καὶ Ἰουδὶθ, καὶ Τωβίας, καὶ διδαχὴ καλουμένη τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ ὁ ποιμήν.—S. Athanas. Epist. Festalis. Op., tom. i. par. 2. p. 963, A.]

[y] [SS. Patrum Apostolicorum Opera. Paris. 1672.]

[z] [Edw. Bernard, Savilian Professor 1673. Annotationes in S. Barnabæ Epistolam et S. Hermæ Pastorem, in Fell's edition. Oxon. 1685. 8vo.]

[a] [L. E. Du Pin. Nouvelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, tom. i. p. 83. 1688. Paris.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. II.

bishop of Lincoln[c], who hath made the apostolic author speak pure and proper English in a venerable apostolic style. But these are a sort of human race who neither fear God nor reverence men, especially priests, whose office they hate, and their persons for the sake of their office. By 'other books of the same stamp,' they particularly meant the book of the Revelations, of which they said, 'it had been well if it had been still kept private, for there had not been so many madmen;' and then cited a sentence of a learned divine against the enthusiasts who had abused it, as if he had said the same thing. Then they said, that 'none of the prophecies could be understood, for multitude of interpretations, that if they were already fulfilled, we were no farther concerned with them, but if not, the Holy Ghost Himself had need interpret them.' Then as for the prophets, they did God and them the honour to compare them to the Camisars[d]; and prophecy to delirium in fevers; and told a story of a physician, who cured a patient of his prophetical deliriums, and was refused his reward. They also said, 'it was a disease proper it may be to certain places and constitutions, as agues;' and took occasion, from a passage in a learned author[e], to assert that 'wine was useful to prepare for the illapses of the prophetical spirit,' and thence observed, 'that drunkenness and pro-

[b] [Tillemont. Memoires, notes sur Saint Hermas, tom. ii. p. 519. 1701. Paris.]

[c] [The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers translated. By W. Wake, D.D. London, 1693. 8vo.]

[d] [More commonly known as the French prophets. The name Camisards was given the insurgent peasantry of the Cevennes at the latter end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century; probably derived from the *camise* which they wore over their clothes. They were excited by fanatics, who pretended to prophetical gifts, (see Bibliotheque Sacrée, Paris. 1822, art. Camisards,) some of whom came over to England in 1706. They created great excitement by their wild gestures and vociferation. They gained many converts to the reality of their pretensions, who endeavoured to justify their agitations by parallels from the Prophets. Hoadly wrote a work against them, entitled "A Brief Vindication of the Ancient Prophets from the imputations and misrepresentations of such as adhere to our present pretenders to inspiration, in a Letter to Sir Richard Bulkeley, Bart." (one of their chief supporters) in which he says, (near the end of the preface,) "They had a tendency to weaken the credit of revealed religion amongst men of unstable principles: by whom they were embraced, and found, and used for that very purpose." They formed a sect which continued to exist for some years, and exercised an influence on the early followers of Wesley.—See Southey's Life of Wesley, at the year 1739.]

[e] [Dodwell, de Jure Laicorum, &c. p. 359. 1685. 'Et vero corporeis id genus auxiliis Judæos usos esse constat ad concipiendum spiritum propheticum. Sic musicam adhibuit Elisæus, cibum filii Esavi et vinum senior Isaacus.']

REAL VIEWS OF AUTHOR, &c.

phecy was the same thing[f].' Behold here Moses and the prophets, whose Divine authority our blessed Lord owned, and Himself with them, blasphemed into drunkards, madmen, or at best into enthusiasts. Behold the Old Testament with the New, which is founded upon it, and bears witness to the truth of it, made no better than the Alcoran, or Notre-Dame's[g] predictions, and by consequence the Jewish and Christian worthies, who believed those two sacred codes to be the oracles of God, and of Divine inspiration, represented to be men as credulous, and as much deluded, as the history of any religion can shew. And then as for the miracles mentioned in the Scriptures, they made many reflections upon them, which another company of such men at a public house not far from Somerset-House, treated with the same reverence, as these did the Scriptures. They exhausted Spinoza the apostate Jew's book, *des Ceremonies Superstitieuses des Juifs*[h]. 'The passing over the Red sea,' they said, 'was not miraculous but natural[i].' By which they gave the lie first to Moses, who tells us 'that it was the blast of the breath of God's nostrils that gathered together the waters of the Red sea, and made them stand upright as an heap:' [Exod. 15. 8.] secondly, to the Psalmist, who saith, 'it was God that divided it, and made Israel to pass through the midst of it; that He rebuked and dried it up, and made the people pass through the depth thereof as through a wilderness;' [Ps. 88. 13.] [Ps. 96. 9.] and lastly, to the Apostle, who tells us, that "by faith they passed through the Red sea as by dry land, which the Egyptians attempt- [Heb. 11. 29.]

[f] [Collins repeated this statement in his "Discourse of Freethinking, occasioned by the Rise and Growth of a Sect called Freethinkers," 1713. p. 121. "to obtain the prophetic spirit they played upon music and drank wine."]

[g] [Michael Nostradamus, (or De Nostre Dame,) a celebrated astrologer, was born in St. Remy, a town of Provence, Dec. 14, 1503; died July 2, 1566. He published Seven Centuries of Predictions in 1555, to which he in 1558 added three centuries. He won the favour of Catherine of Medicis. Charles IX. appointed him his physician in ordinary. See the "True Prophecies of Michael Nostradamus, translated by Theophilus de Garencieres." London, 1672.]

[h] [The work referred to is the Tractatus Theologico-politicus of Spinoza, (Op., tom. i. p. 141. Jenæ. 1802,) which was published at Hamburg in 1670. It was translated into French, and published in 12mo. in 1678, with three different title-pages: 1. La Clef du Sanctuaire, &c. Leyden. 2. Traité des Ceremonies Superstitieuses des Juifs, Amsterdam. 3. Reflexions curieuses d'un esprit désintéressé sur les matières les plus importantes au salut, Cologne. See preface to the above-mentioned edition, pp. xiv—xvi.]

[i] [See Spinoza's work just mentioned, cap. vi. De Miraculis, Op., tom. i. p. 244.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. II.

ing to do were all drowned therein." 'The pillar of fire[k],' they said, 'was some sort of artificial preparation in the nature of a phosphorus,' though it is reckoned by Moses, and in the Psalms, among 'the wonders which God did in the sight of their fathers, when in the day-time He led them with a cloud, and all the night with a light of fire.' 'Elijah's sacrifice,' they said, was by 'artificial fire,' and one of them who was a priest, and undoubtedly a priest after their own heart, 'said he could do the same.' They reflected upon the miracles, which our Saviour did more privately, as when He put all the people out of the ruler of the synagogue's house, and raised his dead daughter only before her father and mother and a few of His disciples. But to return from these to the gentlemen at dinner, and their reflections on the Scriptures; they said, 'there were many contradictions in them, that the Holy Ghost could speak His own mind plainly if He pleased, and therefore that it is the highest blasphemy, and worthy of death, for any to pretend, by their explications of the text, to speak plainer than He, and to interpret the mind of God, as if He were not able to tell His own meaning, and that all priests were monstrously guilty of it, and that the author of the Rights doth the very same thing as Christ and His Apostles did, in speaking against priests.' Lastly, 'that multitudes of religions were as much for God's honour as variety of faces, and that God must have a mind to be so worshipped.'

Deut. 1. 33.

[Ps. 78. 12, 13.]

[Mark 5. 40.]

O blessed table, which was sanctified with such talk as this! Where they also said, that 'the marriage in Cana was a merry meeting,' and that 'He,' meaning our Lord, 'made the water wine with spirit of wine.' And that 'the one thing needful,' of which He spake to Martha, 'was a good dish of meat!' O blessed family, which must hear such table-talk, as blasphemed the Scriptures into contradictions, and reproached the Holy Spirit with not speaking plainly, because in some places He was pleased to wrap up His meaning in figures, and similitudes, and parables, as in the

[k] [This was maintained by Toland in his Tetradidymus (four treatises:) published in 1720, of which the first was entitled "Hodegus, or the Pillar of Cloud and Fire that guided the Israelites in the wilderness, not miraculous."]

REAL VIEWS OF AUTHOR, &c.

prophetical books and other passages of Scripture; and because His plain meaning in other places accidentally became obscure, like the meaning of old human authors, for want of knowing the ancient histories, customs, proverbs, and idioms of speech, which are requisite to make them be understood. How few among us understand the books that were written by our ancestors but two or three hundred years ago? which, however, are plain to those who understand the ancient Saxon and Norman-Saxon tongue. How many dark and difficult places of Scripture have of late been made plain to demonstration by Nic. Fuller, Mede, Lightfoot, and Pococke, and other learned men? But these bravos, because they hate the Scriptures, and because priests for the most part are, and have been expositors of them, damn all expositions, and sentence the expounders, and by consequence all the translators and paraphrasts of them, to death. A modest and merciful sentence! In which is involved the seventy-two interpreters of the Old Testament into Greek, the Chaldee paraphrasts, and, not to mention our blessed Lord, who is not excepted from it, the Apostles, "whose understandings He opened, that they should understand the Scriptures," and with them again the apostolic writers, who expounded and applied several passages of the Old Testament to Christ and His Church under the New; as St. Clement[l], St. Barnabas[m], and the bishops who expounded the prophecies to Constantine[n], and St. Hermas, whom they despise and hate, because he speaks so much and so plainly against sensuality and voluptuousness[o], and in preference of one of the two opposite principles and desires in man to the other, which they love much better, and like the dunghill-cock in the fable, which preferred the corn of barley before the pearl, they value much more. And then, as for the New Testa-

Luke 24. 45.

[l] [e. g. Epist. ad Cor. i. c. xii. the scarlet thread of Rahab is interpreted of the blood of Christ; c. xvi. the fifty-third of Isaiah of our Lord's humiliation; c. xxii. our Lord is understood to be speaking in Ps. xxxiv. 12. Patr. Apost., tom. i. pp. 155, 156, 161.]

[m] [See S. Barnab. Epist. ibid., p. 13, &c.; throughout the epistle the prophecies and types of the Old Testament are explained of Christ and His Church.]

[n] [Sozom. Eccl. Hist., lib. i. c. 3. p. 12.]

[o] [Pastor., lib. ii. Mand. iv. Patr. Apost., tom. i. p. 87, Mand. v. pp. 93, 94, Mand. vi. p. 95. There is not any express notice of the fulfilment or interpretation of prophecy in his writings. Hickes may have referred to his carrying out the typical language of the Old Testament in the similitudes.]

ment, this meek sentence also hangs up all the ancient fathers without mercy, who have rescued the sense of holy writ, even of the Old as well as New Testament, from the perverse interpretations of Jews and heretics, and likewise all the translators of the latter, both ancient and modern, into the eastern or western languages of the Christian world, with all the commentators and critics: nay, their dear fathers, Hobbes, Selden, and Spinoza, and the author of the Rights himself are included in their general doom, with all the Unitarians[p], who have given the world new explications of Scripture in opposition to the old Nicene creed-makers, though I suppose they did not mean those. This censure also highly reflects upon our Lord, who bid the Jews search the Scriptures, who appealed to Moses and the prophets, and bid them observe and do whatsoever the expositors of their law, who sat in Moses's chair, bid them observe. It condemns the Beræans for searching the Scriptures, and Timothy for reading of them from a child, by which he became a Christian; and plainly shews how much these deists and atheists are grieved that the Scriptures are translated and expounded, to maintain revealed religion against them, and that there is yet an order of men, a pestilent order of priests, to read and expound the Scriptures to the people, for which they deserve to be put to death.

These are the men, the worthy men, who hate priests and priesthood; and for my own part, I think it a great honour that our order and persons, for the sake of our order, have them, and the devil, who walks about roaring in them

[p] [The Unitarians were then a recent and an active sect. See Leslie's treatise "The Socinian Controversy discussed, in Six Dialogues, &c." published in 1708. In the preface he says, (Theological Works, vol. i. p. 195, &c.,) "Of late years these Socinians, under the name of Unitarians, have appeared with great boldness, and have not only filled the nation with their numerous pamphlets, printed upon a public stock, and given away gratis to the people, whereby many have been deluded, but they have arrived to that pitch of assurance, as to set up public meetings in our halls in London, (at Salter's Hall,) where some preach to them who have been spewed out even by the Presbyterians for their Socinianism." See also "A Letter of the Lower House of Convocation to the Archbishop and Bishops about books and writings, Feb. 19, 1705:... As likewise to inform your lordships of the scandal given to all good Christians by an assembly of sectarians under the name of Unitarians, publicly held in the city of London, the teacher whereof is notoriously known to have been convicted of denying the divinity of our blessed Saviour." —Wilkins' Concilia, vol. iv. p. 634. Their expositions of texts are given and examined in Leslie's second and third Dialogues, Theol. Works, ibid., p. 248, &c.]

against the priesthood, for our utter enemies. They are as mad against us, as King Philip of Macedon[q] was against the orators of Athens, because they defended the people; they rail against the shepherds, because they would devour the flock, and because the revenues upon which the clergy live would be very convenient for them; they therefore also represent priesthood as priestcraft to the people, and all Christian priests from the beginning, without any exception, as cheats and knaves; cheats, who at first made the Scriptures, and have ever since expounded them: cheats and usurpers, who have assumed to themselves an authority over the people in the name of God and Christ, whom these dare blaspheme as much in private as they reproach His ministers in public; witness the beginning of His miracles in Cana, which, though the Evangelist saith He did "to manifest forth His glory;" yet, according to their blasphemous talk, it was no miracle, but an artful trick to deceive the people; and if it were so indeed, then all His other miracles, from this sham-beginning to the end, must have been such; so alike are the malice and blasphemies by Beelzebub and by spirit of wine.

REAL VIEWS OF AUTHOR, &c.

[Joh. 2. 11.]

The liberty these men have already taken is astonishing[r], and would not be suffered in any other Christian country, and a little more forbearance and impunity will make them presume more[s], and sport themselves in boldness and blas-

[q] [Plutarch. Vit. Demosth. c. 23. pp. 730, 731. Op., Reisk. 1776. It was Alexander, not Philip, who required the Athenians to give up their orators, on which Demosthenes told the story of the sheep giving up their dogs to the wolf. Hickes alludes to the same anecdote more fully, but with the same mistake in the Preface to the Apologetical Vindication.]

[r] See the Axe laid to the Root of Christianity, [vid. note k, p. 53.] with the Preface to the Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England, [By G. Hickes, D.D. Second edit. London, 1706.] and the excellent weekly paper called the Rehearsal, [vid. note i, p. 32.]

[s] Witness the Letter of Enthusiasm to a Lord. Sensus Communis. Soliloquy, or Advice to an Author. Priestcraft in Perfection, and a Detection of the true meaning and wicked design of a book entituled, A Plain and Easy Method with the Deists.

[This note was added in the third edition. The works enumerated had been very recently published. The first three, viz., A Letter concerning Enthusiasm, to my Lord * * * * *. (Somers, ed. 1711.) London, 1708; Sensus Communis, an Essay on the freedom of Wit and Humour, 1709; Soliloquy: or Advice to an Author, 1710, were written by Lord Shaftesbury, and were afterwards collected by him and formed the first volume of his "Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times," published in 1711. The following extracts are from the Letter concerning Enthusiasm: "We shall then be able to see best whether those forms of justice, those degrees of punishment, that temper of resentment, and those measures of offence and indignation, which we vulgarly suppose

phemy still more, and at length crucify their Redeemer, as often, and as impudently in public, as they do with Jewish malice in private. As they have treated Him in His priests, so, if let alone, they will in a little time treat Him in His offices and person, and put Him to open shame in the same names. If in the first part of the Rights they have so abused those of His household, may we not expect in the second that they will abuse the Master of the house? One

in God, are suitable to those original ideas of goodness which the same Divine Being, or nature under Him, has implanted in us, and which we must necessarily presuppose, in order to give Him praise or honour in any kind." p. 51. "Nobody trembles to think that there should be no God; but that there should be one. But this would be otherwise, if Deity were thought as kindly of as humanity."—p. 63.

The following extract from Sensus Communis illustrates the course taken by the deists at this time: "If men are forbid to speak their minds seriously on certain subjects, they will do it ironically. If they are forbid to speak at all on such subjects, or if they find it really dangerous to do so, they will then redouble their disguise, involve themselves in mysteriousness, and talk so as hardly to be understood, or at least not plainly interpreted, by those who are disposed to do them a mischief. . . . 'Tis the persecuting spirit that has raised the bantering one."—Part i. sect. 4. pp. 71, 72.

It is difficult to give an idea of these works by short extracts, but the following from the Soliloquy may shew its character: "It becomes not those who are uninspired from heaven, and uncommissioned from earth, to search with curiosity into the original of those holy rites and records, by law established. Should we make such an attempt, we should in probability find the less satisfaction, the further we presumed to carry our speculations," &c.—Soliloquy, part iii. sect. 3. p. 360.

The full title of the next work is, "Priestcraft in Perfection; or, a detection of the fraud of inserting and continuing that clause, 'the Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith,' in the twentieth article of the Articles of the Church of England;" which is called "one of the most bold, virulent, and malicious pieces against the Church of England and her clergy that even this licentious age of printing has produced." (Seasonable and Modest Apology, p. 13.) It was published anonymously Dec. 1709. In Chalmers' Biog. Dict. (art. Collins) and in the notes to Somers' Tracts, (vol. xii. p. 159, second edit.,) where it is reprinted, it is attributed to Collins. In Watt's Bibliotheca it is attributed to Tindal. Collins continued the controversy.

"A Detection of the true meaning and wicked design of a book entitled A Plain and Easy Method with the Deists, wherein it is proved that the author's (Leslie's) four marks are the marks of the Beast, and are calculated only for the cause and service of Popery, in a Letter to a Friend. London, 1710." The object of the writer is to shew that Leslie's four marks do indeed attach to the chief Scripture miracles, but are found as well in the case of others wrought in support of "heathen and popish" religions which are "universally allowed to be the impostures."—p. 47. It was answered by Leslie (in 1710) in his Vindication of the Short and Easy Method, &c.—(Theol. Works, vol. i. p. 115,) and attributed by him to the same author as Priestcraft in Perfection, and the Rights. He says, "His last instance is p. 43, which leads us to the author of the Detection. It is a noble performance of his own which he quotes, intituled Priestcraft in Perfection, &c. . . . . This is the work he has been lately about in Holland with his friend Toland . . . and other freethinkers. . . . When his Opus Palmare comes out, (which he has concerted with Toland, Le Clerc, &c.) in aid of the Book of the Rights. . . ." (Ibid., pp. 123, 124.)]

REAL VIEWS OF AUTHOR, &c.

of them not long ago told a worthy gentleman, who, upon Christian principles, hath a reverence for the clergy, he would shew him what priests and priesthood were, and then turning to '*Sabini*' in *Festus Pompeius*[t], shewed him these words, *Sabini a cultura deorum dicti, ἀπὸ τοῦ σέβεσθαι. Sabini quod volunt somniant, vetus proverbium esse, et inde manasse ait Sinnius Capito, quod quotiescunque sacrificium propter viam fieret, hominem Sabinum ad illud adhibere solebant: nam his promittebat se pro eis somniaturum, idemque postquam evigilasset sacra facientibus narrabat omne quidquid in quiete vidisset, quod quidem esset ex sacrificii religione. Unde venisse videtur in proverbium, Sabinos solitos quod vellent somniare; sed quia propter aviditatem bibendi quædam anus mulieres id somnium captabant, vulgatum est illud quoque, anus quod volt somniat; fere enim quod vigilantes animo volvimus, id dormientibus patere solet.* In English this means no more nor less than their common blasphemy, "that all religions and priests of all religions are the same." And two of them, whom I could name, after much blasphemous discourse in a lady's house, left a paper of reasons with her, to persuade her ladyship why she should not believe in Christ, calling God the Son by such a name of contempt as I abhor to mention, much exceeding the malice of Julian, who after his apostacy never called Him by any name more opprobrious than the Galilean; and the Galilean, I hope, in His appointed time, will make them, to their own confusion and His honour, say, "*vicisti Galilæe*[u]." Thus these giants make war with heaven, and as they endeavour with the power of hell to pull the priesthood from the Church, so, Lucifer-like, if they could, they would pull the Church from Christ, Christ from the right-hand of God, and God out of His throne. Indeed Julian, if compared with these men, was a person of moderation, principles, and piety; for he was "serious in the religion of their ancestors," as he told the heathens[v], "and in the worship of the gods;" and though

[t] [Sex. Pompeii Festi et Mar. Verii Flacci de Verborum Significatione, lib. xx. pp. 466, 7. Amstelodami, 1699.]

[u] [ἐκεῖνον δέ γε φασὶ δεξάμενον τὴν πληγὴν, εὐθὺς πλῆσαι τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ αἵματος, καὶ τοῦτο βίψαι εἰς τὸν ἀέρα, καὶ φάναι, νενίκηκας Γαλιλαῖε, καὶ κατὰ ταὐτὸ τήν τε νίκην ὁμολογῆσαι, καὶ τὴν βλασφημίαν τολμῆσαι· οὕτως ἐμβρόντητος ἦν.—Theodoret. Hist. Eccl., lib. iii. c. 25. p. 143.]

[v] [See Orat. vii. Juliani Opera, p. 212, B. Misopogon, p. 337, sqq. Fragm. Epist. p. 290, B.]

he was by temper a satirist, and had more wit and human learning than Gebal and Ammon and Amalek; than A[s-gill][x], and C[ollins][y], and St[ephens][z], and T[indal], T[o-land][a], T[utchin][b], and all the execrable clubs of atheists and deists in the town, yet he never reviled the Christian Church, and priesthood, as these new apostates do. He never questioned the authority of the Scriptures, of which he had been reader, nor charged the Christians with "keeping them private, till the council of Laodicea fell a telling noses;" he knew the doctrines of the Christian sect, and their confessions of faith, but he never charged the Christians with inventing their creeds, or imposing articles of faith upon the people, because he knew the Nicene fathers, as witnesses only of the Christian faith, gave in their evidences upon diligent and impartial search of what they found to be the doctrine of the Church, in the writings of their predecessors, from the time of the Apostles to their own time. Of all the Christians, or Christian priests and bishops, Julian ex-

[x] [See note g, p. 51. The blanks have been filled up with the most notorious of the party Dr. Tindal was associated with. To the authorities quoted in the notes to the letter to the author of the Rights, p. 51, may be added the following, as regards Collins in particular, from the Rehearsal, No. 178, Jan. 29, 1706: "and everybody being the people, everybody, a Tutchin, a Tin—ll, or a Coll—ns, may make himself a king or a priest." The Dunciad, book ii. 399.

"Toland and Tindal, prompt at priests to sneer."

Which in the first edition was "*Collins* and Tindal."]

[y] [Antony Collins, one of the most distinguished of the deistical writers, had in 1700 published a tract entitled "Several of the London Cases considered." He was the author of the Letters to Dodwell and Clarke, concerning the immateriality and immortality of the soul, London, 1707, 1708. See Butler's Analogy, Diss. i. In 1707 he published "an Essay concerning the use of reason in propositions, the evidence whereof depends upon human testimony;" which was directed against the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. In 1713, the Discourse on Freethinking, see note f, p. 75; and in 1724, a "Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion." It may be observed that he was, early in life, a most intimate friend of Locke, who in a letter dated Oct. 29, 1703, says, "If I were now setting out in the world I should think it a great happiness to have such a companion as you, who had a true relish for truth, and from whom I might receive it undisguised, and to whom I might communicate what I thought true freely." And Sept. 11, 1704, within two months of his death, "What a treasure have I found in such a friend, with whom I can converse and be enlightened about the highest speculations."]

[z] [See note h, p. 52.]

[a] [See note f, p. 51.]

[b] [John Tutchin, the editor of the Observator. See note i, p. 52. In the reign of James II., being found guilty of a libellous publication, he had been sentenced by Jefferies, to be whipped through the towns of the west of England, and petitioned the king that the sentence might be commuted to that of death: hence Pope,

"Earless on high stood unabashed De Foe,
And Tutchin flagrant from the scourge below."

Dunciad, vol. ii. p. 147.]

REAL VIEWS OF AUTHOR, &c.

pressed most hatred against St. Athanasius. He called him "contemptible fellow," "abominable," "enemy of the gods," "wicked man," "crafty fellow," "impudent[c]," and such like names, but he never called him "Sathanasius," or "creed-making rascal," as our Philistines do, who are sworn together against the priesthood of Christ and His ministers, and fight, I trust in vain, against Him and the Christian faith. But more particularly as to the common office of a priest in all religions, and the common notion of priesthood among all mankind, he was so far from calling or thinking it priest-craft, that he spoke of it and of priests with the greatest honour and veneration, as the ministers of the gods, and mediators and intercessors with them for men. And therefore 'he magnified his office' as chief pontiff, and seems to value himself as much upon the account of it as of the imperial crown. "In relation to the gods[d]," saith he, "I am sovereign pontiff, though not at all worthy of that great honour. But I endeavour to make myself worthy of it by daily prayers unto the gods." "And it is agreeable[e] to reason," saith he, "to honour priests as the liturgs and servants of gods, who minister to us in things pertaining to the gods, (*διακονοῦντας ἡμῖν τὰ πρὸς τοὺς Θεούς,*) and have great power in bringing down their blessings upon us. For they sacrifice and pray for all, and therefore it is right to give as much, or rather more honour to them, than the civil magistrates, (*ἢ τοῖς πολιτικοῖς ἄρχουσι*[f].) But if any one think that

[c] [*ὁ Θεοῖς ἐχθρὸς Ἀθανάσιος.*—Epist. vi. Juliani Opera, p. 376, A. *τὸν μιαρόν.*—Ibid., C. *πανοῦργον.*—Epist. li. p. 435, B. *πολυπράγμων ἀνήρ.*—Ibid., C. *ἀνθρωπίσκος εὐτελής.*—Ibid. *ὄφελε γὰρ Ἀθανασίῳ μόνῳ ἡ τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς αὐτοῦ διδασκαλείου κατακεκλεῖσθαι μοχθηρία.*—Ibid., A.]

[d] Fragment. Orat. p. 546. [(Paris, 1630.) *δοκοῦντά τε εἶναι διὰ τοὺς θεοὺς ἀρχιερέα μέγιστον, ἄξιον μὲν οὐδαμῶς πράγματος τοσούτου, βουλόμενον δὲ εἶναι, καὶ προσευχόμενον ἀεὶ τοῖς θεοῖς.*—Id., Fragm. Epist., p. 298, C. ed. Lips. 1696. Est *epistolæ* pars quam ad Pontificem aliquem scripsit, ut in ea, qualem se domi forisque præstare ejus ordinis homines deberent exemplum statueret.—Dion. Petav. Annott. ad loc.]

[e] [*εὔλογον δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἱερέας τιμᾶν, ὡς λειτουργοὺς θεῶν, καὶ ὑπηρέτας, καὶ διακονοῦντας ἡμῖν τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς, συνεπισχύοντας τῇ ἐκ θεῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς τῶν ἀγαθῶν δόσει· προθύουσι γὰρ πάντων καὶ ὑπερεύχονται· δίκαιον οὖν ἀποδιδόναι πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἔλαττον, εἰ καὶ μὴ πλέον, ἢ τοῖς πολιτικοῖς ἄρχουσι, τὰς τιμὰς· εἰ δέ τις οἴεται τοῦτο ἐπίσης χρῆναι νέμειν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοῖς πολιτικοῖς ἄρχουσι, ἐπεὶ κἀκεῖνοι τρόπον τινὰ τοῖς θεοῖς ἱερατεύουσι, φύλακες ὄντες τῶν νόμων· ἀλλὰ τά γε τῆς εὐνοίας παρὰ πολὺ χρὴ νέμειν τούτοις· οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ καίπερ πολέμιον ὄντα τὸν ἱερέα προσέταττον αἰδεῖσθαι τῷ βασιλεῖ· ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐδὲ τοὺς φιλοὺς αἰδούμεθα τοὺς εὐχομένους ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ θύοντας.*—Ibid., p. 296, B.]

[f] See the Second Letter. [On the dignity of the Episcopal order, chap. i. § 1.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. II.

both are to be equally honoured, because the civil magistrates, as guardians of the laws, are in some sort priests, yet we ought to shew greater respect to those, after the example of the Grecians[g], who persuaded their angry king to reverence a priest as such, though he was their enemy; and therefore shall we not honour priests who are our friends, and pray and sacrifice for us?" "For as long as any man is a priest, he is to be honoured and venerated; but if he is wicked, he is to be deprived of the priesthood, and rejected as unworthy; but as long as he is employed in divine offices and ministry to the gods, he is to be regarded with veneration and religious honour, as the most excellent thing that belongs to the gods[h]." "Therefore as the magistrate, so is the priest honourable, according to the Didymæan oracle of Jove, which threatens destruction to all wicked men, who affront the gods in dishonouring their priests[i]."

In these places and others, where he compares the priest with the civil magistrate, he plainly speaks of the sacerdotal, as distinct from, and independent of, the secular power; and therefore, as chief pontiff, he wrote a letter to Arsacius[k], the chief priest of Galatia, to direct him how he should behave himself suitably to his character, particularly in admonishing and reproving the inferior priests, who neglected their duty or transgressed it, as by going to theatres or taverns, &c., and to

[g] See [chap. ii. sect.] xi. of the First Letter.—[The Christian Priesthood Asserted.]

[h] [ἀλλὰ ἕως ἂν ἱερεύς τις ὀνομάζηται, τιμᾷν αὐτὸν χρὴ, καὶ θεραπεύειν· εἰ δὲ εἴη πονηρὸς, ἀφαιρεθέντα τὴν ἱερωσύνην, ὡς ἀνάξιον ἀποφανέντα, περιορᾷν· ἕως δὲ προθύει, καὶ κατάρχεται, καὶ παρίσταται τοῖς θεοῖς, ὡς τὸ τιμιώτατον τῶν θεῶν κτῆμα, προσβλεπτέος ἐστὶν ἡμῖν μετὰ αἰδοῦς, καὶ εὐλαβείας.—Ibid., D.]

[i] [ἔστω τοίνυν ὥσπερ ἄρχων, οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἱερεὺς πᾶς αἰδέσιμος· ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἀπόφασίς ἐστι θεοῦ τοῦ Διδυμαίου τοιαύτη.

Ὅσσοι ἐς ἀρητῆρας, ἀτασθαλίῃσι νόοιο,
Ἀθανάτων ῥέζουσ' ἀποφώλια, καὶ γεράεσσιν
Ἀντία βουλεύουσιν· ἀδεισιθέοισι λογισμοῖς,
Οὐκέθ' ὅλην βιότοιο διεκπερόωσιν ἀταρπόν·
Ὅσσοι περ μακάρεσσιν ἐλωβήσαντο θεοῖσιν
Ὧν κεῖνοι θέουσεπτον ἔλον θεραπηΐδα τιμήν.

καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἄλλοις ὁ θεὸς φησι,

Πάντας μὲν θεράποντας ἐμοὺς ὀλοῆς κακότητος.

καὶ φησὶν ὑπὲρ τούτων δίκην ἐπιθήσειν αὐτοῖς.—Ibid., p. 297, C.

[k] Ἀρσακίῳ Ἀρχιερεῖ [Epist. xlix. τοὺς ἡγέμονας ὀλιγάκις ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας ὅρα· τὰ πλεῖστα δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐπίστελλε· εἰσιοῦσι δὲ εἰς τὴν πόλιν ὑπαντάτω μηδεὶς αὐτοῖς ἱερέων· ἀλλ' ὅταν εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ φοιτῶσι τῶν θεῶν, εἵσω τῶν προθύρων· ἡγείσθω δὲ μηδεὶς αὐτῶν εἴσω στρατιώτης· ἐπέσθω δὲ ὁ βουλόμενος· ἅμα γὰρ εἰς τὸν οὐδὸν ἦλθε τοῦ τεμένους, καὶ γέγονεν ἰδιώτης· ἄρχεις γὰρ αὐτὸς, ὡς οἶσθα, τῶν ἔνδον· ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ θεῖος ταῦτα ἀπαιτεῖ θεσμὸς· καὶ οἱ μὲν πειθόμενοι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν εἰσὶ θεοσεβεῖς· οἱ δὲ ἀντεχόμενοι τοῦ τύφου, δοξοκόποι εἰσὶ καὶ κενόδοξοι.—p. 431, C. See also Sozom., Hist. Eccl., lib. v. cap. 16. p. 203.]

REAL VIEWS OF AUTHOR, &c.

deprive them when they were incorrigible. He warned them [him?] "to invite the great secular officers and magistrates seldom to his house, but to write often to them; and when any of them made their entrance into the city, to let no priest meet them at the gate, but when they came to the temples to meet them at the porch, and to let no officers go in before them, because they came to the temple as other people (*ὡς ἰδιώτης,*) to worship in their private capacity, and because the priest was superior in the temple to all that came, according to the law of the gods; to which whosoever are obedient are truly religious, but those who are disobedient through arrogance are proud and vain-glorious persons." As chief pontiff also he suspended a priest for beating another priest. "Wherefore[1]," saith he, "seeing I am, according to the rites of the religion of our fathers, sovereign pontiff and chief priest of Apollo Didymæus, I forbid you for three whole months not to do any thing that belongs to the office of a priest. But if in the meantime you behave yourself well, and seem worthy, and the chief priests of the city shall write to me to certify me thereof, I shall then consult the gods whether I shall restore you. This punishment I inflict upon you for your folly and presumption. . . . . But I will beg of the gods that upon your prayers to them you may obtain pardon for your fault."

Julian was a serious pagan in his religion, and led a philosophical, austere life, in temperance, continence, and self-denial, and I have cited these things out of his works concerning the common notion of priests and priesthood, to confirm what I have written of them in the first letter, and for a testimony against our utter despisers and shameless revilers of them, especially in the Rights of the Christian Church. But Julian shall rise up in judgment against them, and it shall be more tolerable for him, in the day of judgment, than for them, who crucify Christ afresh in the Christian priesthood, and put Him to open shame, in calling it priest-

[1] [*ἐγὼ τοίνυν ἐπειδήπερ εἰμι κατὰ μὲν τὰ πάτρια μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς· ἔλαχον δὲ νῦν καὶ τοῦ Διδυμαίου προφητεύειν, ἀπαγορεύω σοι τρεῖς περιόδους σελήνης μήτοι τῶν εἰς ἱερέα μηδὲν ἐνοχλεῖν· εἰ δὲ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ φανείης ἄξιος, ἐπιστείλαντος μοι τοῦ τῆς πόλεως ἀρχιερέως, εἰ παραδεκτὸς εἴης ἡμῖν, ἐσαῦθις μετὰ τῶν θεῶν βουλεύσομαι· ταύτην ἐγώ σοι τῆς προπετείας ἐπιτίθημι ζημίαν. . . . καὶ συνεύχομαί σοι πολλὰ λιπαρήσαντι τοὺς θεοὺς ἀδείας τυχεῖν ὧν ἐπλημμέλησας.*—Ibid., p. 451, B, D.]

craft. For the same reasons have I taken notice of the distinction he made between the sacerdotal and civil power, and of his own different capacities, as an emperor and a priest. Indeed both powers were united in him, but then his exercising sacerdotal power and jurisdiction as chief priest, when he did not act as emperor, shews that the sacerdotal is different from the imperial power, and that they may be in different subjects as well as in one. This testimony of Julian about the dignity of the sacerdotal office, and of its being of a distinct nature from the imperial, agrees with my second letter, which shews, that they were actually separated from one another, and actually belonged to different persons of different characters and commissions, in the Christian Roman empire. For as all mankind, of what nation or religion soever, by the light of common reason, agreed in the notions of a deity, of divine worship, of temples, and altars; so by the same common light of reason, they all agreed in the notion of the priesthood, and of the difference between the sacred and civil power; and this argument, from the common notion and consent of mankind, is of such force, that these sons of Belial and blasphemy have no way to avoid it but by saying, that priests of all nations and religions are and have been alike, all cheats and knaves, all deceivers of the people; and that priesthood, and all the pretended powers of it, is nothing but priestcraft; and by consequence so must the common notion of a God, of Divine worship, and of temples, and altars be. But why do I say by consequence, when they boldly assert it? And though the author of The Rights dares not yet speak so plain of the common notion of a God, and of Divine worship, yet he saith it in consequence, by calling priesthood in common priestcraft, and asserting[m], that the Christian priests borrowed the custom of excluding men from the Holy Communion, and of excommunication, from the heathen priests, particularly from the Druids, "who by excluding from sacrifices whom they pleased, got all power into their hands[n]." He might as well, had he pleased, have asserted, that they borrowed the notion of a God, and the custom of Divine worship, and the institution of priesthood

[m] chap. iii. [p. 88.]

[n] [Rights, p. 98, where Tindal quotes the passage from Cæsar de Bell. Gall., lib. v. c. 13.]

REAL VIEWS OF AUTHOR, &c.

itself, and the doctrine of Christ's mediation, and of the other world, from them, as the History of Religion* most blasphemously in too plain intimations affirms. Nay, had he pleased, he might have said, they borrowed it from the Mexican or other American priests, before the Spaniards conquered the West Indies; or have asserted with his usual assurance that Moses borrowed the invention of the ark of the covenant from them; for we are assured by those who have written accounts of those barbarous people, that the devil, the ape of the great God, led them about with an ark.

I have said thus much about this synagogue of libertines, the true synagogue of Satan among us, to shew those who are not yet acquainted with their doctrine and manners, what kind of men they are who have this infernal spite at priesthood, which derives itself from God, and at the dignity, discipline, and authority of the sacerdotal order, which they are permitted to tell the world in broad English is nothing but usurpation, and by consequence, that not only the Christian and Jewish, but the patriarchal priesthood, hath been all along pure cheat, and that Melchisedec himself, whom the Scripture calls "priest of the most high God," Melchisedec, the type of our Saviour, in His sacerdotal and regal office, Melchisedec, to whom the father of the faithful paid tithes, and from whom he received his sacerdotal blessing, as the less from the greater, that this great high-priest was no better than the rest, a mere priestcraft villain and knave. I would to God our temporal governors, to whose consciences I now speak, would appoint a committee to examine their works, particularly The Rights of the Christian Church, and if they find they write truth and reason, then to depose the whole

[Gen. 14. 18.]

[Heb. 7. 1—7.

* [This work was published anonymously in 1694, by Sir Robert Howard. It professed to be an account of the corruptions of religion by pagan and popish priests. It was said he had thought of adding "as it hath been abused by priestcraft," to the title. He covertly included in these corruptions doctrines and institutions of Divine appointment. For example, he speaks of "strange and puzzling methods of religious ceremonies and mysteries, and of various rites of sacrificing, good for nothing but to confound and distract the minds of men," (p. 310,) and says, "In very deed, creeds were the spiritual revenges of dissenting parties upon one another." (p. 312.) The author had suffered for Charles I., held office under Charles II., "was a strong advocate for the Revolution, and became so passionate an abhorrer of the nonjurors, that he disclaimed all manner of conversation and intercourse with them. He died in 1698."—Chalmers' Biogr. Dict. The work was reprinted in 1709, with other deistical tracts, appended to the Account of the Growth of Deism.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. II.

order of priesthood, as Tiberius did that of the Druids among the Celts[p]: for if it be but priestcraft, it is intolerable in human societies; or let them slay us, if they please, as Jehu did the priests of Baal, or set the people, whom we have deluded to such a degree, in one general massacre upon us. For if we continue the same usurped spiritual authority over them, by the same knavish craft whereby, these men say, it was at first obtained, we deserve no better usage from their hands; but if quite otherwise they find their books, particularly this of The Rights, to be full of falsehood, impudence, and blasphemy, then let them animadvert upon them, and their authors, be it in the gentlest manner they think they would be treated in any other Christian nation of the world[q].

SECT. III. Additional testimonies to the doctrines of the two discourses.

I am not insensible, what I have written in the following letters about the Christian priesthood and its sacrifice, and of the powerful intercession of priests with God, especially in the holy Eucharist, may at first sight amuse and startle, not only many of the laity who have not been conversant in these theories, but even some of the clergy, of whom I may say, I hope without offence, as Ger. Vossius[r] did of Keckerman, that they are *Viri cæteroquin eruditi, sed novellorum*

[p] [Pliny, speaking of the practice of human sacrifices, says, "Gallias utique possedit, et quidem ad nostram memoriam. Namque Tiberii Cæsaris principatus sustulit Druidas eorum, et hoc genus vatum medicorumque."—Hist. Nat., lib. xxx. c. 1. § 4. Suetonius however says that it was Claudius who entirely abolished this superstition in Gaul. Vita Claudii, c. xxiv., "Druidarum religionem apud Gallos diræ immanitatis, et tantum civibus sub Augusto interdictam, penitus abolevit." Tiberius may have attempted it only, or, as Ernest (annot. in Suet. ad locum) supposes, the name of the emperor in Pliny may be an error.]

[q] [At this time the Church party, as they were called, were continually urging the government to take some means to suppress or prevent the irreligious publications which were coming out. See the books referred to in the notes to pp. 51—53. See also the letter of the lower house of convocation about books and writings, 1705, referred to note k, p. 54, (Wilkins, vol. iv. p. 634,) and the representation of the lower house on the state of religion, in 1710. The view taken by others is expressed by Burnet, in speaking of Dr. Sacheverel's trial; at which passages from most of the infidel books noticed by Hickes had been brought forward. He says, "As for his invective against the dissenters and the toleration, they laboured to turn that off, by saying he did not reflect on what was allowed by law, but on the permission of, or the not punishing many, who published impious and blasphemous books: and a collection was made of passages in books, full of crude impiety, and of bold opinions. This gave great offence to many, who thought that this was a solemn publishing of so much impiety to the nation, by which more mischief would be done than by the books themselves; for most of them had been neglected, and known only to a small number of those who encouraged them; and the authors of many of these books had been prosecuted and punished for them."—Own Times, vol. ii. p. 541.]

[r] De Hist. Græc., lib. ii. cap. 13. [Op., tom. iv. p. 125. col. 2. Amstelodami. 1695—1701.]

ADDIT. TESTIMONIES.

scriptorum, quam antiquitatis studiosiores. And therefore though I think I have said nothing on these subjects but what I have proved by the concurrent testimonies of the best ancient Christian writers, yet the better to prepare such readers for my book, I beg leave to add some more both ancient and modern authorities, which in a crowd of thoughts escaped my notice, and which will farther shew that I have advanced nothing but what is catholic doctrine, being far from affectation of singularities or novelties, which are dangerous in divinity, and generally serve to no end, be the authors of them never so learned, but to gratify the common enemies of revealed religion, who are apt to make very ill use and advantage of them.

I begin with Gregory Nazianzen, who in his thirtieth oration speaks of Moses as a priest, thus[s], "He, by the secret and mystical figure in which he put his hands, turned the Amalekites to flight; for the hands of a priest held up on the mountain, [and formed to a mystical figure] in prayer, did what many thousands of men could not do." And then, turning his oration to Anthimus Tyanensis, or some other factious intruding bishop[t], who made use of military force, saith he[u], "What canst thou say, O son of Dathan and Abiram, and maddest of captains, who durst rise up against Moses, who hast lift up thy hands against us, as they did [their tongues] against that great servant of God? How, wast thou not afraid? wast thou not ashamed to do so? and didst thou not sink into the ground? How couldest thou, after this, lift up those hands to God, and offer with them to Him, and intercede for the people?" And in his seventeenth oration speak-

[s] [οὗτος (sc. ὁ Θεὸς) κατεπολέμησε τὸν Ἀμαλὴκ, χειρῶν ἀπορρήτῳ καὶ μυστικῷ σχήματι· τοῦτο γὰρ ἴσχυσαν ἱερέως χεῖρες ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους αἰρόμεναι, καὶ εἰς εὐχὴν τυπούμεναι, ὃ πολλαὶ μυριάδες οὐκ ἴσχυσαν.—S. Greg. Nazianz., Orat. xiii. (al. xxx.) Op., tom. i. p. 253, C, D.]

[t] ["Quem hic designet Gregorius ambiguum. Elias Anthymum esse putat; immerito quidem, ut in Mon. n. 2. declaratur. Billius, quendam Episcopum Anthimo sc. addictum. Novus operum S. Basilii Editor, (Bened.) in ejus vita tom. iii. c. xxiv. n. 3. p. cxvi. probabilius certe, Presbyterum quemdam Tyanensem, qui contra Basilium pugnaverat, et in ipsum etiam injecerat manus, ut ab Anthimo gratiam iniret." — Ed. Ben. annott. ad locum.]

[u] [Τί φὴς, ὦ παῖ Δαθὰν καὶ Ἀβειρὼν, καὶ στρατηγὲ ἀσωφρόνιστε, ὁ κατὰ Μωϋσέως τολμήσας, καὶ χεῖρας ἐπαφεὶς ἡμῖν, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνοι τὰς γλώσσας τῷ μεγάλῳ θεράποντι; οὐκ ἔφριξας; οὐκ ἐνετράπης; οὐκ ἐρῤῥευσάν σοι ταῦτα διανοουμένῳ κατὰ γῆς αἱ σάρκες; εἶτα τὰς χεῖρας ταύτας ἀνατείνεις τῷ Θεῷ; εἶτα δῶρα προσάξεις; εἶτα ὑπερεύξῃ λαοῦ;—Ibid., § 3. p. 254, C.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. III.

ing to the angry governor of Nazianzum, who was offended at the people, saith he[x], "What, Sir, would you have my father offer his hoary hairs, and his great number of years, and his long unblemished priesthood to you, to appease you; his unblemished priesthood, which perhaps the holy angels, the servants of the most holy God, reverence as much as their own ministry. Have I now said enough to soften you? or shall I say something more boldly? For grief makes me very bold. I now then offer you Christ, Christ who was humbled for us; the passion, and cross of Christ, who yet was impassible, the nails by which I am absolved from sin, His blood, His burial, His resurrection and ascension, and this table, of which we now communicate, and the symbols of my salvation, which I consecrate with the same mouth with which I now make intercession to thee; I say, I now present unto thee this most holy mystery which exalts us unto heaven." And in his third oration, which is against Julian, with whom he had studied at Athens, saith he of him[y], "He defiled his baptism with the impure and abominable blood of initiatory sacrifices, returning, as it is in the proverb, like a sow to the wallowing in the mire; and polluted his hands, in cleansing and purging of them of the unbloody sacrifices, by which we communicate with Christ, and His sufferings, and His Godhead." And in his first oration, giving a reason of his unwillingness to be made a bishop[z] before he had prepared himself, saith he, "Knowing

[x] [*ἢ δεῖ, καὶ τὴν πολιάν σοι ταύτην ἀνθ' ἱκετηρίας προσαγαγεῖν, καὶ τὸν τῶν ἐτῶν ἀριθμὸν, καὶ τὴν μακρὰν ἱερωσύνην καὶ ἄσπιλον ταύτην, ἣν αἰδοῦνται τυχὸν καὶ ἄγγελοι, καθαρῶς τῷ καθαρωτάτῳ λατρεύοντες, ὡς τῆς ἑαυτῶν λατρείας ἀξιάν· πείθει ταῦτα; ἢ τὶ τολμήσω μεῖζον; τολμηρὸν δέ με ποιεῖ τὸ ἀλγεῖν. Χριστὸν προσάγω σοι, καὶ τὴν Χριστοῦ κένωσιν τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, καὶ τὰ τοῦ ἀπαθοῦς πάθη, καὶ τὸν σταυρὸν, καὶ τοὺς ἥλους, οἷς ἐλύθην ἐγὼ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ τὴν ταφὴν, καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, καὶ τὴν ἄνοδον, ἣ καὶ τὴν τράπεζαν ταύτην, ᾗ κοινῇ πρόσιμεν, καὶ τοὺς τύπους τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας, οὓς ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τελῶ στόματος, ἀφ' οὗ ταῦτα πρός σε πρεσβεύω, τὴν ἱεραν καὶ ἄνω φέρουσαν ἡμᾶς μυσταγωγίαν.*—Orat. xvii. § 12. Op., tom. i. p. 325, A, B. The name of the magistrate is not known, most probably he was not the governor, and the circumstances of the occasion are only matter of conjecture. —Monitum, ibid., p. 316.]

[y] [*αἵματι μὲν οὐχ ὁσίῳ τὸ λουτρὸν ἀποβρύπτεται, τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς τελειώσει τὴν τελείωσιν τοῦ μύσους ἀντιτιθεὶς, ὗς ἐν βορβόρῳ κυλισθεὶς, κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν· καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἀφαγνίζεται τῆς ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας ἀποκαθαίρων, δι' ἧς ἡμεῖς Χριστῷ κοινωνοῦμεν, καὶ τῶν παθημάτων καὶ τῆς θεότητος.*—Orat. iv. (al. iii.) tom. i. p. 101, A, B.]

[z] [Rather "a priest." The title of this oration in the older editions contained the words *καὶ ὁποῖον εἶναι δεῖ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον*, which are omitted by the Benedictine editors; Gregory had been ordained priest on Christmas Day, A.D. 361, had fled into Pontus, and returned at Easter, A.D. 362, when, after a short

ADDIT. TESTIMONIES.

these things[a], and that no man is worthy of the great God, sacrifice, and High-Priest, who hath not first presented himself a living and holy sacrifice to God, or not testified his reasonable well-pleasing service, or not sacrificed to God the sacrifice of praise and a contrite heart, (which is the[b] only sacrifice the Giver of all things requires of us,) how durst I presume to offer up unto Him that external figure of the great mysteries" (of the body and blood of Christ[c],) "or how could I take upon me the name and habit of a bishop, before I had purified my hands with holy works?" In this passage it is observable how the holy father distinguishes the private, or personal sacrifice, by which a Christian man prepares himself for the priestly office, and the public sacrifice which he

oration on the festival, he delivered this, in which he gives the reasons of what he had done: see Monit. in Orat. ii. p. 10, and Vita S. Greg. § lxxi. p. xciv. tom. i. of the Benedictine edition.]

[a] [*Ταῦτα οὖν εἰδὼς ἐγὼ, καὶ ὅτι μηδεὶς ἄξιος τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ θύματος, καὶ ἀρχιερέως, ὅστις μὴ πρότερον ἑαυτὸν παρέστησε τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, μηδὲ τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν, εὐάρεστον ἐπεδείξατο, μηδὲ ἔθυσε τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως καὶ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον, ἣν μόνον ὁ πάντα δοὺς ἀπαιτεῖ παρ' ἡμῶν θυσίαν, πῶς ἔμελλον θαῤῥῆσαι προσφέρειν αὐτῷ τὴν ἔξωθεν, τὴν τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀντίτυπον· ἢ πῶς ἱερέως σχῆμα καὶ ὄνομα ὑποδύεσθαι, πρὶν ὁσίοις ἔργοις τελειῶσαι τὰς χεῖρας*;—Id., Orat. ii. (al. i.) § 95. Op., tom. i. p. 56, D, E.]

[b] Here it is to be observed, that terms of exception, in all languages, are not always to be taken in an exclusive, but sometimes in a comparative sense, as only denoting the things signified by the nouns to which they are joined, to be the chief, or most eminent and excellent, of their kind. So when the father here saith, "that the sacrifice of a contrite heart is the only sacrifice God requires," he means the chief and most excellent sacrifice, without which no other sacrifice is acceptable to Him. So if a man should say, "God only is good," or, in our Saviour's phrase, "None is good but one, that is God," [Matt. xix. 17.] he must be understood in the comparative sense, viz., that in comparison to God none is good, because He is supereminently, infinitely, and essentially good. Such is that in the Greek prayers, [Missa S. Joan. Chryst. Goar. Euchologium, p. 74.] *Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ μόνος ἅγιος*, "O Lord God, who only art holy." The like is to be observed of phrases, as well as terms, of exception: as where St. Paul said, "I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified," [1 Cor. ii. 2.] he meant not to exclude Christ's resurrection and ascension, &c. as the father here, in saying, that the "internal sacrifice of a contrite heart was the only sacrifice" which God requires, meant not to exclude the external oblation, or sacrifice, of bread and wine in the Eucharist, as appears from the passage itself, and from another to the same purpose, Orat. xxix. de [dogmate et] Constitutione Episcoporum: *Ταῦτα οὖ εἰδὼς ἐγὼ, καὶ ὅτι [μηδεὶς ἄξιος τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ, καὶ θύματος, καὶ ἀρχιερέως, ὃς μὴ πρότερον ἑαυτὸν παρέστησε τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν ζῶσαν, μᾶλλον δὲ, ναὸς ἅγιος ἐγένετο Θεοῦ ζῶντος καὶ ζῶν· κ. τ. λ.* — Id., Orat. xx. (al. xxix.) § 4. Op., tom. i. p. 377, D. ed. Ben.] I therefore knowing these things, and that no man is worthy of God, and the sacrifice, and to be a chief priest (i. e. a bishop), who hath not first presented himself a living sacrifice to God, or rather is not first become the [living] temple of the living God.

[c] See Orat. xi. p. 187. [*καὶ εἴ πού τι τῶν ἀντιτύπων τοῦ τιμίου σώματος ἢ τοῦ αἵματος ἡ χεὶρ ἐθησαύρισεν.*—Id., Orat. viii. (al. xi.) § 18. Op., tom. i. p. 229, D.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. III.

is to offer when he is made a priest. The former he metaphorically calls a living, holy, and acceptable, and his reasonable service, in allusion to the Apostle, "I beseech you, brethren, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." But then the other "public sacrifice," which a priest so prepared is only worthy to offer, is *τὴν ἔξωθεν, τὴν τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀντίτυπον,* "that external sacrifice," or oblation, "which is the figure," or representation, "of the great mysteries," i. e. of the mysteries of the body of Christ which was crucified, and of His blood which was shed for the redemption of the world. This figure, or representation, of the dead body and effused blood of Christ, he elsewhere[d] calls, in the style of the Church, "the unbloody sacrifice, by which we communicate, or have communion, with Christ." These latter words he said, after he shewed how unreasonable it was for any man to ascend to the episcopate in haste[e], "Who would," saith he[f], "make a defender of the gospel, that is to stand before God with angels, and glorify Him with archangels, and whose office it is to transmit sacrifices upward to the altar above, and execute the priest's office with Christ[g], who would make such an one, as they form a statue of clay, in a day." And in the beginning of his letter to Simplicia, he applies this part of the character of a bishop, of being priests with Christ, to Basil the great bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; saith he[h], "In this you do well, that you have commended that our holy and common father, that pillar of the faith, that rule of truth, and that hoary pattern of a Church full of wisdom[i], who surpassed the common measure of human life, and virtue,

Rom. 12. 1.

[d] Orat. iii. adversus Julian. p. 70. *Τῆς ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας, δι' ἧς ἡμεῖς Χριστῷ κοινωνοῦμεν.*—[Orat. iv. § 52. Op., tom. i. p. 101, B. ed. Ben. See note y, p. 90.]

[e] [See note z, p. 90.]

[f] [*τίς ὁ πλάττων καθάπερ αὐθήμερον τοὺς πηλίνους, τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας προστάτην, τὸν μετὰ ἀγγέλων στησόμενον, καὶ μετὰ ἀρχαγγέλων δοξάσοντα, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄνω θυσιαστήριον ἀναπέμψοντα τὰς θυσίας, καὶ Χριστῷ συνιερεύσοντα, κ. τ. λ.*; — Id., Or. ii. (al. i.) § 73. Op., tom. i. p. 48, C.]

[g] *καὶ Χριστῷ συνιερεύσοντα.* So *συνεργοῦντες*, 2 Cor. vi. 1. So *Θεοῦ γὰρ ἐσμεν συνεργοί*, 1 Cor. iii. 9.

[h] [*Ἐπαινεῖς τὸν ἅγιον καὶ κοινὸν ἡμῶν πατέρα, τὸ τῆς πίστεως ἔρεισμα, τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας κανόνα, καὶ χαρακτῆρα τῆς εὐσεβείας,[τῆς Ἐκκλησίας,* ed. Paris. 1630.] *τὴν πλήρη φρονήσεως πολιὰν, τὸν ζωῆς ἀνθρωπίνης καὶ ἀρετῆς μέτρα νικήσαντα, τὸν πιστὸν θεράποντα, καὶ μέγαν ἀρχιερέα, τὸν Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων* [*ἄνθρωπον,* ed. 1630.] *μεσίτην, τὸ τοῦ πνεύματος καταγώγιον· τοῦτο μὲν ὀρθῶς ποιεῖς.*— S. Greg. Naz. Epist. lxxix. ad Simpliciam, (al. xxxviii.) Op., tom. ii. p. 70, A.]

[i] [Rather, "that pattern of piety, that hoary head full of wisdom."]

ADDIT. TESTIMONIES.

that great high-priest and mediator between God and man, who was the mansion of the Holy Spirit." So in his fifteenth Iambic[k],

> Ἱερωσύνη δὲ ἁγνισμὸς φρενῶν,
> Θεῷ φέρων ἄνθρωπον, ἀνθρώπῳ Θεόν.
>
> *Mentes sacerdos*[l] *purgat, et sanctas facit,*
> *Hominem Deoque copulans, homini et Deum.*

so the Latin; "the priesthood[l] purifies the minds of men, bringing together man to God, and God to man." To which I may add two of his verses in his eleventh poem to the bishops[m]:

> Ὦ θυσίας πέμποντες ἀναιμάκτους, ἱερῆες·
> [Ὦ ψυχῶν ταμίαι μεγακύδεες· Ὦ μεγάλοιο
> πλάσμα Θεοῦ χείρεσσιν ἐν ὑμετέρῃσι φέροντες·]
> Ὦ Θεὸν ἀνθρώποισι μέγ' ἔξοχον εἰς ἓν ἄγοντες.

O you priests, who offer up unbloody sacrifices!

and,

O your great dignity[n]! who reconcile men to God.

So his father Greg. Nyssen[o]. *Nam si is, qui ad expiandum populum delectus est, indiget ipse expiatione, quid fiet illi qui ejusmodi munus non sustinet?* "for if he who is chosen to make atonement for the people, needs atonement himself, what can become of such an one who doth not sustain his function?"

In these citations we have the priests, the unbloody sacrifice, the atonement and expiation they make by it, in virtue of the bloody propitiatory sacrifice which is commemorated and represented by it, and the great dignity and excellency of the sacerdotal office, which by presenting this sacrifice to

[k] Tom. ii. p. 201. [S. Greg. Naz. Poemata, lib. i. sect. ii. Carm. 34. (al. 15.) line 227, 228. Op., tom. ii. p. 622. Paris. 1840.]

[l] [Hickes quotes the Latin of the edition of 1630, that of 1840 is "sacerdotium."]

[m] [Ibid., lib. ii. sect. i. Carm. 13. (al. 11.) lines 1—4. p. 824.]

[n] [Hickes follows the Latin of the edition of 1630, which was pointed accordingly,

'Munus omnium longe præstantissimum.'

That of 1840 gives,

'O qui hominibus summam Dei majestatem conciliatis.']

[o] [S. Greg. Nyss. Orat. Ad eos qui durius et acerbius alios judicant. Op., tom. ii. p. 135. col. 1, B. Paris. 1638. St. Gregory Nazianzen's father was not St. Gregory Nyssen, but Gregory, afterwards bishop of Nazianzum. St. Gregory Nyssen was brother of St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen's friend.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. III.

God upon earth, in union with the other that Christ presents unto Him in heaven, reconciles God to men. This was the ancient Christian divinity, and it is the summary and design of my first letter, and the clergy will never have the just reverence they ought to have for their own character, nor the people that respect they should have for their persons, till these truths are openly professed in the Church. "Jesus Christ," saith St. Cyprian[p], "was the author and institutor of this sacrifice." And "our Lord after supper[q] offered up the cup of wine mixed with water;" and, "if we are the priests[r] of God and Christ, I cannot tell whom we should rather follow than God and Christ." And[s] "who was more the priest of the most high God than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered sacrifice to the Father, and offered the very same sacrifice that Melchisedec offered, that is bread and wine, to wit, His body and blood?" So[t], "in which part we find the cup to have been mixed which the Lord offered, and that to have been the wine which He called His blood[u]."

And[x], "if Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, is the High-Priest of God the Father, and first offered Himself to the Father, and commanded this to be done in commemoration of Himself, then that priest is truly His vicegerent, who imitates what Christ did." To these let me add the other authorities of this father, as those in his first Epistle, where he declares, "that they who were honoured with the priesthood," which then was esteemed a great honour, "and ordained to the clerical office and ministry, ought not to serve but at the

[p] Jesus Christus Dominus et Deus noster, sacrificii hujus auctor et doctor. —[S. Cyprian., Epist. lxiii. ad Cæcilium. Op., p. 104, ed. Ben.]

[q] [Post cœnam, mixtum calicem obtulit Dominus.—Ibid., p. 109.]

[r] [Nam si sacerdotes Dei et Christi sumus, non invenio quem magis sequi quam Deum et Christum debeamus.—Ibid., p. 110.]

[s] Nam quis magis sacerdos Dei summi quam Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui sacrificium Deo patri obtulit, et obtulit hoc idem quod Melchisedech obtulerat, id est, panem et vinum, suum scilicet corpus et sanguinem.—[Ibid., p. 105.]

[t] Qua in parte invenimus calicem mixtum fuisse quem Dominus obtulit, et vinum fuisse quod sanguinem suum dixit.—[Ibid., pp. 106, 107.]

[u] [Rather, "and that that was wine which," &c. Oxf. Transl., 1843. p. 186. St. Cyprian is arguing against those who offered water only.]

[x] Si Jesus Christus, Dominus et Deus noster, ipse est summus sacerdos Dei patris, et sacrificium patri se ipsum primus obtulit, et hoc fieri in sui commemorationem præcepit, utique ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur qui id quod Christus fecit imitatur, et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in ecclesia Deo patri, si sic incipiat offerre secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse.—[Ibid., p. 109. ed. Ben.]

ADDIT. TESTIMONIES.

altar and sacrifices, and give themselves to supplication and prayers . . . . as God appointed the Levites to do, who were never to be called off from their ministry, nor to recede from the altar and sacrifices, but night and day to attend in their spiritual employment. Which," saith he, "our pious ancestors considering, judged that none of the dying brethren should appoint a clergyman curator of his will, and that if any did so, no oblation should be made for him, nor sacrifice solemnized for his repose. For he doth not deserve to be named at the altar in the prayers of the priests, who would call off the priests from the altar." So in his fifth Epistle, when he cautions that they should not visit the martyrs and confessors in too great numbers, saith he[y], "consider and take care how this may be done more discreetly and safely: I advise that the presbyters, who offer," that is, administer the Eucharist, "where the confessors are imprisoned, go thither severally with their several deacons, and that by turns, because change of persons is of great use to prevent the invidious observation of those who meet together." So in his seventeenth Epistle[z]; "Notwithstanding I hear that some of the presbyters . . . . have already begun to communicate with lapsers, and offer" at the altar "for them, and give them the Eucharist," &c. So in Epistle lvii.[a], "on the contrary it is our great glory to have given the peace to the martyrs, as priests who daily celebrate sacrifices to God, and prepare a host for those who are to conflict with the enemy, and victims for them

[y] [. . . quando singuli divino sacerdotio honorati et in clerico ministerio constituti non nisi altari et sacrificiis deservire et precibus atque orationibus vacare debeant. . . Cujus ordinationis et religionis formam levitæ prius in lege tenuerunt, . . . ut qui divinis ministeriis insistebant, in nulla re avocarentur, nec cogitare aut agere . . . sæcularia cogerentur. Quæ nunc ratio et forma in clero tenetur, ut qui in ecclesia Domini ordinatione clerica promoventur, in nullo ab administratione divina avocentur, . . . ab altari et sacrificiis non recedant, sed die ac nocte cælestibus rebus et spiritalibus serviant. Quod episcopi antecessores nostri religiose considerantes et salubriter providentes censuerunt ne quis frater excedens ad tutelam vel curam clericum nominaret, ac si quis hoc fecisset,] non offerretur pro eo, nec sacrificium pro dormitione ejus celebraretur. Neque enim apud altare Dei meretur nominari in sacerdotum prece qui ab altari sacerdotes et mīnīstros voluit avocare.—[Epist. lxvi. (i. ed. Oxon.) Op., p. 114. ed. Ben.]

[z] [Consulite ergo et providete ut cum temperamento hoc agi tutius possit, ita ut presbyteri quoque quī illic apud confessores offerunt, singuli cum singulis diaconis per vices alternent, quia et mutatis personarum et vicissitudo convenientium minuit invidiam. —Epist. iv. (v. ed. Oxon.) Op., p. 9. ed. Ben.]

[a] [Audio tamen quosdam de presbyteris] . . . jam cum lapsis communicare cœpisse et offerre pro illis et eucharistiam dare.—[Epist. xi. (xvii. ed. Oxon.) Op., p. 21. ed. Ben.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. III.

who overcome him[b]." So in Epistle lxiii.[c] *Si vinum tantum quis offerat,* "if any offer wine only," &c. So in Epistle lxv.[d], *quando nec oblatio sanctificari illic possit, ubi Spiritus Sanctus non sit,* "seeing the oblation cannot be sanctified there where the Holy Spirit is not." This was said against Fortunatianus, who, after he had sacrificed to idols, would nevertheless act as a bishop, as if he had never lapsed, which gave occasion to express himself against him in the following manner[e]: "I was grieved that he should pretend to act as a priest, who had betrayed the priesthood, as if it were lawful for a priest to come to God's altar, who had offered at the altar of the devil." So[f], "how can he think he can officiate as a priest of God who obeyed the priests of the devil, or how can he be worthy to offer the sacrifice of God and our Lord's prayer, with a sacrilegious and criminal hand, seeing God in the

[b] Episcopatus nostri honor grandis et gloria est, pacem dedisse martyribus, ut sacerdotes qui sacrificia Dei quotidie celebramus, hostias Deo et victimas præparemus.—[Id. Epist. liv. (lvii. ed. Oxon.) Op., p. 78. ed. Ben.] Why I have paraphrased hosts and victims as I have done, may be seen from Isidore, lib. xvi. cap. 19. Hostiæ apud veteres dicebantur sacrificia, quæ fiebant antequam ad hostem pergerent. Victimæ vero sacrificia, quæ post victoriam devictis hostibus immolabantur. —[S. Isidori Hispalensis Origines, lib. vi. c. 19. § 33, 34. Op., tom. iii. p. 294. Romæ, 1797.] And so Servius in lib. i. Æn. 334,

[Multa tibi ante aras nostra cadet hostia dextra.

Hostiæ dicuntur sacrificia, quæ ab his fiunt, qui in hostem pergunt. Victimæ vero, sacrificia quæ post victoriam fiunt. Sed hæc licenter confundit authoritas.—P. Virgilii Maronis Bucolica, &c. cum Mauri Servii Honorati Comment.—p. 193, E. Paris. 1600.]

This distinction of the Eucharistical oblation, before and after the conflict, by hostia and victima, is evident from this Epistle; At vero nunc non infirmis, sed fortibus, pax necessaria est, nec morientibus, sed viventibus, communicatio a nobis danda est; ut quos excitamus et hortamur ad prælium non inermes et nudos relinquamus, sed protectione sanguinis et Corporis Christi muniamus; et cum ad hoc fiat eucharistia, ut possit accipientibus esse tutela, [quos tutos esse contra adversarium volumus, munimento dominicæ saturitatis armemus.] Nam quomodo docemus aut provocamus eos in confessione nominis sanguinem suum fundere, si eis militaturis Christi sanguinem denegamus?—[ibid., pp. 77, 78. ed. Ben. The passage is more correctly translated, "that we who, as priests, daily celebrate the sacrifices of God, should prepare oblations and victims for Him."—Oxf. Transl. p. 139. See Ep. lxxvii. p. 159. quoted p. 98.]

[c] [Si vinum tantum quis offerat, sanguis Christi incipit esse sine nobis. St. Cyprian had said just before that the people of Christ are represented by the water mixed with the wine, aquas populos significare, &c.—Id. Ep. lxiii. ad Cæcilium, Op., p. 108. ed. Ben.]

[d] [Id. Epist. lxiv. (lxv. ed. Oxon.) ad Epictetum. Op., p. 112. ed. Ben.]

[e] [Quæ res contristavit me, primo propter ipsius, qui . . . audet sibi adhuc sacerdotium quod prodidit vindicare, quasi post aras diaboli accedere ad altare Dei fas sit.—Ibid., pp. 110, 111. ed. Ben.]

[f] [Quomodo se putat posse agere pro Dei sacerdote, qui obtemperavit et servivit diaboli sacerdotibus, aut quomodo putat manum suam transferri posse ad Dei sacrificium et precem Domini, quæ captiva fuerit sacrilegio et crimini, quando in Scripturis divinis Deus ad sacrificium prohibeat accedere sacerdotes etiam in leviori crimine constitutos. (Lev. xxi. 17; Exod. xix. 22; xxviii. 43.)—Ibid., p. 111. ed. Ben.]

ADDIT. TESTIMONIES.

Scriptures hath forbidden priests to sacrifice for lesser crimes?" So in Epistle lxvii., which is a synodical determination of the African bishops in the case of Basilides and Martialis, two Spanish bishops who were Libellatics[g], the fathers speak as followeth[h]; "When we met together we read your letters ... in which you signified to us that your bishops, Basilides and Martialis, had defiled themselves with taking out certificates that they sacrificed to idols, and you desired our opinion in the case;...but it is not so much from our determination, as from the Divine commandments, that we send an answer, for it hath long since been declared by a voice from heaven, and determined by the law of God, who and what kind of men ought to serve at the altar, and offer sacrifice to God, for in Exodus, &c.... We ought therefore to set these things before our eyes, and seriously and religiously to consider them, that we may choose and ordain none for bishops, but men of unblemished conversations, *qui sancte, et digne sacrificia Deo offerentes,* who holily and worthily offering the sacrifices to God, may be heard in the prayers which they make for the people." I cannot but take notice here how exactly this father's phrase, '*sancte et digne sacrificia Deo offerentes,*' answers to that of St. Clement[i], τοὺς ἀμέμπτως, καὶ ὁσίως προσενέγκοντας τὰ δῶρα, in the Latin version of Junius[k], *qui sancte et sine reprehensione offerunt mu-*

[g] [Libellatici, the name given to those who, in the times of persecution, had obtained certificates that they had sacrificed to idols. See Bingham, book xvi. c. 4. § 6.]

[h] [Cum in unum convenissemus, legimus litteras vestras, ... significantes Basilidem et Martialem libellis idololatriæ commaculatos, et nefandorum facinorum conscientia vinctos, episcopatum gerere et sacerdotium Dei administrare non oportere; et desiderastis, rescribi ad hæc vobis ... Sed enim desiderio huic vestro, non tam nostra consilia, quam divina præcepta respondent, quibus jampridem mandatur voce cœlesti, et Dei lege præscribitur, quos et quales oporteat deservire altari et sacrificia divina celebrare. In Exodo namque, (Exod. xix. 22; xxviii. 43; Lev. xxi. 17.)...Quæ ante oculos habentes, et sollicite ac religiose considerantes, in ordinationibus sacerdotum non nisi immaculatos et integros antistites eligere debemus, qui sancte et digne sacrificia Deo offerentes, audiri in precibus possint quas faciunt pro plebis dominicæ incolumitate.—Epist. lxviii. (lxvii. ed. Oxon.) Ad clerum et plebem in Hispania consistentes de Basilide et Martiale. Op., pp. 117, 118. ed. Ben.]

[i] [ἁμαρτία γὰρ οὐ μικρὰ ἡμῖν ἔσται, ἐὰν τοὺς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσίως προσενέγκοντας τὰ δῶρα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλωμεν.—Ep. i. ad Cor. § xliv. Patr. Apost., tom. i. p. 173.]

[k] Non enim leviter peccabimus, si eos repudiaverimus, qui sancte et sine reprehensione episcopatus munera offerunt.—pp. 57, 58. Clementis ad Cor. Epist. Prior, edidit Patricius Junius (Patrick Young.) Oxon., 1633. 4to. Corrected thus by the Oxford editor of Junius' edition: "Non enim leviter peccabimus, si eos, qui sancte et sine reprehensione offerunt munera, episcopatu ejicimus."—p. 101. 12mo. Oxon., 1669.]

nera; nor can I imagine for what reason the right reverend Dr. Wake, bishop of Lincoln, should translate them otherwise in the following period[1]; "for it would be no small sin in us, should we cast off those from their ministry, who holily and without blame fulfil the duties of it." I confess he puts "offer the gifts" in the margin; but why his lordship put the true and common version in the margin, and one so different from it in the text, he can best tell. But to return to the synodical Epistle of the African bishops; they afterwards speak thus[m], "and seeing there are many other grievous crimes of which Basilides and Martialis are guilty, in vain do they pretend to re-enter upon their episcopal office, seeing it is evident that such men cannot preside over the Church of Christ, nor ought to offer sacrifices to God." So in his seventy-fifth Epistle, Firmilian, speaking of the woman possessed by the devil who administered the holy Eucharist, "she presumed," saith he[n], "to consecrate the bread, and minister the Eucharist by the usual invocation, and offer sacrifice to the Lord in the accustomed solemn form." So in Epistle lxxvi. "But in this distress," saith the father[o], "there is no great danger like to come to our religion, because the priests of God cannot offer, and celebrate the Divine sacrifices;" which in the next words he distinguishes from the metaphorical sacrifice of an humble and contrite heart: *Sacrificium Deo spiritus contribulatus, cor contritum et humiliatum* [*Deus non despicit.*] . . . *Hoc sacrificium sine intermissione die ac nocte celebratis, hostiæ facti Deo, et vosmetipsos sanctas atque imma-*

[1] [The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers translated, p. 35. ed. 2. Lond. 1710.]

[m] [Cumque alia multa sint et gravia delicta, quibus Basilides et Martialis implicati tenentur, frustra tales episcopatum sibi usurpare conantur, cum manifestum sit ejusmodi homines nec ecclesiæ Christi posse præesse, nec Deo sacrificia offerre debere.—S. Cyprian. Epist. lxviii. (lxvii. ed. Oxon.) Op., p. 119. ed. Ben.]

[n] [Etiam hoc frequenter ausa est, ut et invocatione non contemtibili sanctificare se panem, et eucharistiam facere simularet, et sacrificium Domino non sine sacramento solitæ prædicationis offerret.—Epist. lxxv. Firmiliani, p. 223. S. Cyprian. Ep. ed. Fell, Oxon. 1682.] The Benedictine edition (p. 146.) following the MSS., omits the 'non' before 'sine.' Fell inserted it as required by the context; see his note on the place.]

[o] [Sed nec in illo, fratres dilectissimi, aliqua potest aut religionis aut fidei jactura sentiri, quod illic nunc sacerdotibus Dei facultas non datur offerendi et celebrandi sacrificia divina . . . 'Sacrificium Deo spiritus contribulatus, cor contritum et humiliatum Deus non despicit.' Hoc vos sacrificium Deo offertis, hoc sacrificium sine intermissione die ac nocte celebratis, hostiæ facti Deo, et vosmetipsos sanctas atque immaculatas victimas exhibentes, &c. —Epist. lxxvii. (lxxvi. ed. Oxon.) Ad Nemesianum et cæteros martyras in metallis constitutos.—p. 159. ed. Ben.]

ADDIT. TESTIMONIES.

culatas victimas exhibentes, &c. I have observed before[p] how Gregory Nazianzen made the same distinction, between the proper material external sacrifice in the holy Eucharist, by bread and wine, and the metaphorical sacrifice of a contrite heart, and as I have faithfully rendered these passages out of St. Cyprian, so I desire the impartial reader to revise them, and to consider if they are to be understood in a metaphorical sense. Was the cup, which, he saith, our Lord offered up after supper, a metaphorical oblation? Were the oblations of bread and wine, which rich and poor offered, metaphorical oblations[q]? Was the very same sacrifice of bread and wine in the holy Eucharist which Melchisedec offered, a metaphorical sacrifice? And when he speaks of *presbyteri qui offerunt,* and of such *quos oporteat deservire altari,* did he not believe Christian presbyters to be offering, sacrificing, and altar-priests?

To the modern testimonies I have cited for this doctrine in my first letter, I beg leave to add two or three more out of the writings of our learned divines, who have wrote of the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as of a sacrifice, altogether as plainly as I have done. Dr. Dan. Brevint, late dean of Lincoln[r], in his excellent little book entituled "The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice[s]," to use his own words[t], hath endeavoured, as he speaks, "to set this holy Sacrament at liberty," without regard to "papists or protestants," "and rescue it out of the hands of such," as have not treated rightly of it, "and to restore it to the full meaning and institution of Christ." He observes[u] that 'as the primitive heretics whom the spirit of Antichrist set up, ... endeavoured to destroy the natural body, which is the human nature of Christ; so His sacramental body hath not received much better entertainment from two contrary parties, who make it

[p] [pp. 91, 92.]

[q] [The passage alluded to seems to be, Locuples et dives es, et dominicum celebrare te putes, quæ corban omnino non respicis, quæ in dominicum sine sacrificio venis, quæ partem de sacrificio quod pauper obtulit, sumis.—S. Cypr., Lib. de Opere et Eleem. Op., p. 242. All offered, a portion was taken for the Eucharist, the rest given to the clergy and poor. See Bingham, book xv. chap. ii. § 1.]

[r] [He became dean of Lincoln the 3rd of January, 1681, and died May 5, 1695.]

[s] Printed in 12mo. at the Theatre in Oxford, 1673.

[t] Epistle Dedicatory. [This and the following passage are loosely quoted and partly paraphrased.]

[u] Ibid., p. 3.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. III.

either a false god or an empty ceremony.' I forbear to transcribe any more, referring the reader to the discourse itself, which I wish were reprinted, for the honour of God and the benefit of the Church.

Dr. Taylor plainly asserts this holy Sacrament to be a sacrifice, in chap. x. sect. 4, of his Rule of Holy Living[x], where he saith, that "the celebration of the holy Sacrament succeeds to the most solemn rite of natural and Judaical religion[y], the law of sacrificing." And that "as Christ represents to His Father the great effective sacrifice which He offered on the cross, as a means of atonement and expiation for all mankind; . . . . so He hath appointed that the same ministry shall be done upon earth too, in our manner and according to our proportion; and therefore hath instituted and separated an order of men [who] by.... sacramental representation [may] pray unto God after the same manner, that our Lord and High-Priest doth, that is to offer to God, and represent in this solemn prayer and sacrament, Christ as already offered, ... whereby our prayers may for His sake and in the same manner of intercession, be offered up to God [in our behalf, and for all those for whom we pray, and to all those purposes for which Christ died."]

And so in the Office for the Holy Communion in his Collection of Offices[z]: "Be Thou well pleased, O Lord, with this our service and duty, and grant that with a holy fear and pure conscience we may finish this service, presenting a holy sacrifice holily unto Thee, that Thou mayest receive it in heaven, and smell a sweet odour in the union of the eternal sacrifice, which our blessed Lord perpetually offers, and accept us[a] graciously, as Thou didst entertain the gifts of Abel, the sacrifice of Noah, the services of Moses and Aaron, the peace-offering of Samuel," &c. So in the Prayer of Consecration[b]: "Have mercy upon us, O heavenly Father, according to Thy glorious

[x] [§ 1. Bp. Taylor's collected Works, vol. iv. p. 265. Lond. 1839.]

[y] [§ 4. ibid., p. 266.]

[z] [A Collection of Offices or Forms of Prayer in cases ordinary and extraordinary, taken out of the Scriptures, and the ancient Liturgies of several Churches, especially the Greek, (intended to be used whilst the English Office was forbidden.) 1651. Works, vol. xv. pp. 292, 293.]

[a] [The previous editions of Hickes had "it." The first, and other editions of Taylor "us." There are no other material variations in these quotations.]

[b] [Works, ibid., pp. 299, 300.]

mercies and promises; send Thy Holy Ghost upon our hearts, and let Him also descend upon these gifts," and "[that He may] bless, and sanctify these gifts." So in the Prayer of Oblation[c]; "We.... humbly present to Thee, O Lord, this present sacrifice of remembrance and thanksgiving," &c. So also in the Prayer for the Catholic Church, all after the ancient practice; "Receive, O eternal God[d], this sacrifice, for and in behalf of all Christian people," &c.

The bishop of Sarum, on Article xxxi., writes of the holy Eucharist in these words[e]: "In two other respects it may be also more strictly called a sacrifice. One is, because there is an oblation of bread and wine made in it, which being sanctified[f], are consumed in an act of religion. To this many passages in the writings of the fathers do relate. This was the oblation (which was) made at the altar by the people: and though at first the Christians were reproached, as having a strange sort of religion, in which they had neither temples, altars, nor sacrifices, because they had not those things in so gross a manner as the heathens had; yet both Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, and all the succeeding writers of the Church, do frequently mention the oblations that they made; and in the ancient liturgies they did with particular prayers offer the bread and wine to God, as the [great] Creator of all things; those were called the gifts or offerings, which were offered to God in imitation of Abel, who offered the fruits of the earth in a sacrifice to God. Both Justin Martyr, Irenæus, the Constitutions, and all the ancient liturgies, have very express words relating to this. Another respect, in which the Eucharist is called a sacrifice, is, because it is a commemoration and a representation to God of the sacrifice that Christ offered for us on the cross. .... Upon these accounts we do not deny but that the Eucharist may be well called a sacrifice: but still it is a commemorative sacrifice, and not propitiatory[g]." And afterwards[h]: "All that (the first ages) may say in homilies,

[c] [Ibid., p. 301.]

[d] [Ibid., p. 303.]

[e] [Exposition of the XXXIX Articles, pp. 477, 478. Oxford, 1819.]

[f] [For "sanctified," the word used by Burnet, the earlier editions of Hickes had "sacrificed;" there were other unimportant variations which have been corrected by brackets.]

[g] The bishop means not propitiatory in itself, or by its own virtue, as the papists assert their sacrifice of the mass to be.

[h] [Burnet, ibid., p. 481.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. III.

or treatises of piety, concerning the 'pure offering' that, according to Malachi, all Christians offered to God in the Sacrament, [concerning] the 'sacrifice,' and 'the unbloody sacrifice' of Christians, must be understood to relate to the prayers and thanksgivings that accompanied it, to the commemoration that was made in it of the sacrifice offered once upon the cross, and finally, to the oblation of the bread and wine, which they so often compare both to Abel's sacrifice, and to Melchisedec's offering bread and wine." And I wish his lordship had been pleased to add expressly, what is implied, that the Eucharist was also called a sacrifice by the ancients, because the oblation of bread and wine, which they compared to other external sacrifices, was always brought to the priest to be presented by him, as sacrificial gifts to God upon the holy table, or altar, and after the prayer of thanksgiving to be consecrated by him in a second solemn oblation[i], in which he said, not only "we offer unto Thee these gifts," but "these gifts, which are set before Thee; those gifts, of which Thou hast no need, and we beseech Thee to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon them, to sanctify them, and make them unto us the (mystical) body and blood of Christ." This in substance is the form of consecration in all the ancient Greek offices, as I have shewed in my first letter[k], and was restored by the compilers of the Scottish liturgy[l] to the prayer of consecration.

It is plain that Bishop Andrewes thought the holy Eucharist to be the Christian sacrifice, by this prayer in his Greek and Latin devotions[m].

Ὁ ἄνω τῷ Πατρὶ συγκαθήμενος,
καὶ ὧδε ἡμῖν ἀοράτως συνὼν,

[i] [See Christian Priesthood, chap. ii. sect. x. § 5. *προσφέρομέν σοι . . . τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο . . . καὶ ἀξιοῦμέν σε ὅπως εὐμενῶς ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα ἐνώπιόν σου, σὺ ὁ ἀνενδεὴς Θεὸς, καὶ εὐδοκήσῃς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ καταπέμψῃς τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, τὸν μάρτυρα τῶν παθημάτων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου.* Const. Apost., lib. viii. c. 12. p. 481, A.]

[k] [Ibid., § 6.]

[l] ["Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and of Thy Almighty goodness, vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify, with Thy Word and Holy Spirit, these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son." The order of administration of the Lord's Supper, in the Book of Common Prayer, printed for the use of the Church of Scotland, 1637. See Appendix, No. 2.]

[m] pp. 214, 215. [Oxon. 1675.]

ADDIT. TESTIMONIES.

ἐλθὲ εἰς τὸ ἁγιάσαι τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα[n], καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν, καὶ δι' ὧν, καὶ ἐφ' οἷς προσκομίζονται.

Qui sursum cum Patre sedes,
et invisibilis hic præsens nobiscum es,
Veni ut sanctifices dona proposita,
[et] pro quibus, et a quibus, et quibus de causis offeruntur.

Thou, Lord, who with the Father sitt'st on high,
Present to us below invisibly:
Come, sanctify the gifts before Thee laid,
By, or for whomsoe'er the offering's made;
Or for whatever cause the poor acknowledgment is paid.

Dr. Heylin in his Antidotum Lincolniense[o], (London, printed 1637.) chap. 5. cites a noble testimony out of Eusebius, *De Demonstratione Evangelica,* about the priesthood, altar, and sacrifice of the Christians, with which I will here present the reader in his own version: "(Eusebius) brings in this prediction[p] from the prophet Esay, that 'in that day there shall be an altar to the Lord, in the midst of the land of Egypt.' Then adds[q], 'that if they had an altar, and that they were to sacrifice to Almighty God, *πάντως που καὶ ἱερωσύνης ἀξιωθήσονται,* they must be thought worthy of a priesthood also. But the Levitical priesthood could not be of any use unto them,' and therefore they must have another. 'Nor was this spoke,' saith he[r], 'of the Egyptians only, but of all other nations, and Isa. 19. 19.

[n] Const. Apost., lib. viii. cap. 12. Τὰ *προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα ἐνώπιόν σου;* [Concilia, tom. i. p. 481, A.] cap. 13. *ὑπὲρ τοῦ δώρου τοῦ προσκομισθέντος κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ.* [p. 484, B.] See the whole Prayer in the Liturgy of St. John Chrysost. in Goar's Euchologium. [Εὐχολόγιον: sive Rituale Græcorum. Opera F. Jacobi Goar. Paris. 1647. The Offertorium Majus begins (p. 74) with the prayer, Εὐχὴ *προσκομιδῆς μετὰ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ τραπέζῃ τῶν θείων δώρων ἀπόθεσιν, ἣν λέγει ὁ ἱερεὺς μυστικῶς.* See the Christian Priesthood, chap. ii. sect. x. § 6. iii.]

[o] [See note a, p. 1.]

[p] [*βοᾷ δὲ διαῤῥήδην, καὶ κέκραγεν ὁ Ἡσαΐας, θεσπίζων ἅμα καὶ λέγων, ἔσται θυσιαστήριον τῷ Κυρίῳ ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγύπτου, κ. τ. λ.*—Euseb., De Demonstratione Evang., lib. i. c. 6. p. 19, C. Antidotum Lincolniense, by P. Heylin, sect. ii. c. 5. pp. 22—24. London, 1637.]

[q] [*εἶτα δὲ θύοντες Αἰγύπτιοι τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεῷ, πάντως που καὶ ἱερωσύνης ἀξιωθήσονται· ἱερωμένων δῆτα Αἰγυπτίων τὰ περὶ Λευιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἐκ διαδοχῆς Ἀαρὼν Μωσεῖ διατεταγμένα, οὐκέτ' ἂν γένοιτο τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις χρήσιμα.*—Euseb., ibid., p. 20, A.]

[r] [*σκέψαι δ' οὖν εἰ μὴ σήμερον, λέγω δὴ καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς, ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁρῶνται οὐ μόνον Αἰγύπτιοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶν γένος τῶν πρὶν εἰδωλολατρῶν ἀνθρώπων. . . . . τὸν τῶν προφητῶν Θεὸν ἀνακαλούμενον· καὶ εὔχονται δὲ οὐκέτι πλείοσι κυρίοις, ἑνὶ δὲ τῷ μόνῳ Κυρίῳ κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν λό-*

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. III.

idolatrous people; who now pour forth [their] prayers, not unto many gods, but to the one and only Lord: and unto Him erect an altar for reasonable and unbloody sacrifices, (*καὶ τούτῳ θυσιαστήριον ἀναίμων καὶ λογικῶν θυσιῶν . . . ἀνεγήγερται*) in every place of the whole habitable world, according to the mysteries of the New Testament.' Now what those mysteries were, he declares more fully in the tenth chapter of the said first book. 'Christ,' saith he[s], 'is the propitiatory sacrifice for all our sins, since when even those amongst the Jews are freed from the curse of Moses' law, *εἰκότως τὴν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τὴν ὑπόμνησιν ὀσημέραι ἐπιτελοῦντες*, celebrating daily (as they ought) the commemoration of His body and blood, which is a far more excellent sacrifice and ministry, than any in the former times.' Then adds, that Christ our Saviour[t], 'offering such a wonderful and excellent sacrifice to His heavenly Father for the salvation of us all, appointed us to offer daily unto God the commemoration of the same, *ἀντὶ τῆς*[u] *θυσίας*, for and as a sacrifice.' And anon after, that[x] 'whensoever we do celebrate *τούτου τοῦ θύματος τὴν μνήμην*, the memory of that sacrifice on the table, participating of the elements[y] of His body and blood, we should say with David, Thou preparest a table for me in the presence of mine enemies, Thou anointest my head with oil, my cup runneth over. Wherein,' saith he, 'he signifieth most manifestly the mystical unction, *καὶ τὰ*

γιον, καὶ τούτῳ θυσιαστήριον ἀναίμων καὶ λογικῶν θυσιῶν, κατὰ τὰ καινὰ μυστήρια τῆς νέας καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης, καθ' ὅλης τῆς ἀνθρώπων οἰκουμένης ἀνεγήγερται.—Ibid., p. 20, B, C.]

[s] [*εὕρηται ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου καθάρσιον. . . . . διὸ καὶ Ἰουδαίων οἱ εἰς αὐτὸν ἠλπικότες ἐλεύθεροι τῆς Μωσέως ἀφίενται κατάρας, εἰκότως τὴν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τὴν ὑπόμνησιν ὀσημέραι ἐπιτελοῦντες, καὶ τῆς κρείττονος ἢ κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς, θυσίας τε καὶ ἱερουργίας ἠξιωμένοι.*—Ibid., c. x. p. 37, A, B. "wherefore even those amongst the Jews who have believed on Him are freed from the curse of Moses' law," &c.]

[t] [*μετὰ δὴ πάντα οἷόν τι θαυμάσιον θῦμα, καὶ σφάγιον ἐξαίρετον τῷ πατρὶ καλλιερησάμενος, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁπάντων ἡμῶν ἀνήνεγκε σωτηρίας, μνήμην καὶ ἡμῖν παραδοὺς, ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς προσφέρειν.*—Ibid., p. 38, C.]

[u] [See note j, p. 11.]

[x] [*τούτου δῆτα τοῦ θύματος τὴν μνήμην ἐπὶ τραπέζης ἐκτελεῖν, διὰ συμβόλων τοῦ τε σώματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου αἵματος, κατὰ θεσμοὺς τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης παρειληφότες, πάλιν ὑπὸ τοῦ προφήτου Δαβὶδ παιδευόμεθα λέγειν, ἡτοίμασας ἐνώπιόν μου τράπεζαν, ἐξ ἐναντίας τῶν θλιβόντων με· ἐλίπανας ἐν ἐλαίῳ τὴν κεφαλήν μου, καὶ τὸ ποτήριόν σου μεθύσκον με ὡς κράτιστον· διαρρήδην γοῦν ἐν τούτοις καὶ τὸ μυστικὸν σημαίνεται χρίσμα, καὶ τὰ σεμνὰ τῆς Χριστοῦ τραπέζης θύματα, δι' ὧν καλλιερουῦντες τὰς ἀναίμους καὶ λογικὰς αὐτῷ τε προσηνεῖς θυσίας διὰ παντὸς βίου τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων προσφέρειν Θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ πάντων ἀνωτάτου Ἀρχιερέως αὐτοῦ δεδιδάγμεθα.*—Ibid., p. 39, A, B.]

[y] [See note z, p. 10.]

ADDIT. TESTIMONIES.

σεμνὰ τῆς Χριστοῦ τραπέζης θύματα, and the reverend sacrifices of Christ's table, where we are taught to offer up unto the Lord, by His own most eminent and glorious Priest, the unbloody, reasonable, and most acceptable sacrifice, all our life long.' This he entitles afterwards[z], 'the sacrifice of praise,' 'the divine, reverend, and most holy sacrifice,' 'the pure sacrifice of the New Testament.' So that we see, that in this sacrifice prescribed the Christian Church by our Lord and Saviour, there were two proper and distinct actions; the first, to celebrate the memorial of our Saviour's sacrifice, which he entitles, *τὴν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ ὑπόμνησιν*, the commemoration of His body and blood once offered, *τοῦ θύματος τὴν μνήμην*, the memory of that His sacrifice; that is, as he doth clearly expound himself, that we should offer *μνήμην ἀντὶ τῆς θυσίας*, this our commemoration for a sacrifice; the second, that withal we should offer to Him the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which is the reasonable sacrifice of a Christian man, and to Him most acceptable. Finally, he joins both these together in the conclusion of that book, and therein doth at full describe the nature of this sacrifice; which is thus as followeth[a], *οὐκοῦν καὶ θύομεν καὶ θυμιῶμεν τότε μὲν τὴν μνήμην τοῦ μεγάλου θύματος, κ.τ.λ.* 'therefore,' saith he, 'we sacrifice, and offer as it were with incense, the memory of that great sacrifice, celebrating the same according to the mysteries by Him given unto us, and giving thanks to Him for our salvation, with godly hymns and prayers to the Lord our God; as also offering to Him our whole selves, both soul and body, and to His High-Priest, which is the Word.' See here, Eusebius does not call it only the memory, or commemoration, of Christ's sacrifice, but makes the very memory or commemoration, in and of itself, to be a sacrifice, which *instar omnium*, for, and in the place of, all other sacrifices, we are to offer to our God, and offer it with a *θυμιῶμεν*, the incense of our prayers and praises." To this passage let me

[z] [*θυσίαν αἰνέσεως . . . τὸ ἔνθεον, καὶ σεμνὸν, καὶ ἱεροπρεπὲς θῦμα . . . κατὰ τὴν καινὴν διαθήκην τὴν καθαρὰν θυσίαν.*— Ibid., p. 40, A.]

[a] [*οὐκοῦν καὶ θύομεν, καὶ θυμιῶμεν· τότε μὲν τὴν μνήμην τοῦ μεγάλου θύματος, κατὰ τὰ πρὸς αὐτοῦ παραδοθέντα μυστήρια ἐπιτελοῦντες, καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν εὐχαριστίαν δι' εὐσεβῶν ὕμνων τε καὶ εὐχῶν τῷ Θεῷ προσκομίζοντες· τότε δὲ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ὅλῳ καθιεροῦντες αὐτῷ, καὶ τῷ γε Ἀρχιερεῖ αὐτοῦ Λόγῳ, αὐτῷ σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ ἀνακείμενοι.*— Ibid., p. 40, B, C.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. III.

add another for the sake of those presbyters, who doubt whether they are proper priests, out of the same chapter.

"And first[b] beginning with the priesthood, in case you are not grown ashamed of that holy calling, you may remember that you were admitted into holy orders by no other name; being presented to the bishop at your ordination, you did require to be admitted to the order of priesthood[c], and being demanded by the bishop, 'if you did think in your heart that you were truly called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this Church of England, unto the ministry of the priesthood,' you answered positively, that 'you did.' If you thought otherwise than you said, as you do sometimes, you 'lied not unto men, but unto God.' Look in the Book of Ordination, and you shall find it oftener than once or twice, entitled the office of priesthood, and the holy office of priesthood; the parties thereunto admitted, called by no other name than that of priests; or if you think the Book of Ordination is no good authority, (to which you have subscribed however in your subscription to the articles;) look then upon the Liturgy, and the rubrics of it, by which you would persuade the world that you are very much directed in all this business; find you not there the name of priest, exceeding frequent, especially in that part thereof which concerns the Sacrament? 'The priest standing at the north side of the table' . . . 'then shall the priest rehearse distinctly all the ten commandments' . . .'then shall the priest say to them that come to receive the holy communion' . . . 'then shall the priest turning himself to the people, give the absolution'[d] . . . 'then shall the priest kneeling down at God's board,'[e]" &c.

Acts 5. 4.

Bishop Stillingfleet saith[f], "It is the peculiar honour of the Christian religion, to have an order of men set apart, not merely as priests to offer sacrifices, (for that all religions have had,) but as preachers of righteousness, to set good and evil before the people committed to their charge." This is exactly agreeable to that of St. Hierom, in his Epistle to Evagrius[g],

[b] [Antid. Linc., sect. ii. c. 5. pp. 27, 28.]

[c] Book of Ordination.

[d] ["Then shall the priest or the bishop (being present) stand up, and turning himself to the people, say thus."—The Booke of Common Prayer, &c. London, 1607.]

[e] [Ibid.]

[f] [Visitation Charge, Sept. 11, 1690. In his Collected Works, vol. iii. p. 621. London, 1710.]

[g] [Ad Evangelum, "Veteres editiones falso hanc Epistolam inscribunt

ADDIT. TESTIMONIES.

De gradibus presbyteri et diaconi. Ut sciamus traditiones apostolicas sumptas de veteri testamento, quod Aaron et filii ejus atque Levitæ in templo fuerunt, hoc sibi episcopi et presbyteri et diaconi vendicent in Ecclesia. So in his Epistle *Ad Nepotianum*[h], *Esto subjectus pontifici tuo . . . . . Quod Aaron et filios ejus, hoc esse episcopum et presbyteros noverimus.* Those who desire more authorities may consult the Appendix[i], to which I refer the reader.

And to these authorities of learned men in print, I shall add others of no less moment out of an interleaved Book of Common Prayer[k], with notes, which I happened to meet with, and value very much. In the Prayer of Consecration on these words, "sufficient sacrifice," *et paulo post*, "*that* His precious death[l]." "*That.* This word refers to the sacrifice mentioned in lin. 8, for we still continue and remember [commemorate, MS.] that sacrifice which Christ once made upon

ad Evagrium; quum MSS. Codices, quoscumque vidi, retineant Evangelum vel Evangelium."—Not. edd. Ben. ad locum, tom. ii. p. 1166. Epist. cxlvi. tom. i. p. 1077, col. i. D, E. S. Hieronymi Op., Vallarsii. Veronæ, 1734.]

[h] [Epist. lii., ibid., p. 260. col. 2, B, D.]

[i] [Appendix, Nos. vii., viii., ix.]

[k] This book was imprinted in folio at London by Robert Barker, printer to the king's most excellent majesty, Anno Dom. 1617. I cannot tell who was the author or collector of the notes, but perhaps some other person may by these following observations: At the third exhortation to the Communion, he refers to his sermon on the Pharisee and Publican, Luke xviii. 13, part 2. At the prayer before consecration, "vid. Conc. nostram, in 1 Cor. xi. [27.] 'Whosoever shall eat,'" &c. He speaks of Bishop Overall, as then bishop of Norwich. At baptism. "Vide Concionem meam ad John iii. [5.] 'Except ye be born of water,'" &c. "Liber Constit. Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, qui compositus est ab illo qui πολλῶν ἀντάξιος ἄλλων, J. O."—He often calls him my Lord Overall in his notes. In the Catechism at these words, "Secondly, in God the Son, who hath redeemed me," &c. "Vide Concionem meam in hunc locum tempore pomeridiano." At the office of burial, "Vide Concionem nostram ad Ps. xcvi. [9.] 'O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness.'"

[The whole of the notes in this Prayer Book are printed in the additional notes appended to Nichols' Comment on the Common Prayer, 1710, who gives this account of them. "MSS. notes written in an interleaved Common Prayer-Book, in the bishop of Durham's library, printed in the year 1619, supposed to be made from the collections of Bishop Overall, by a friend or chaplain of his: a copy of which MS. is in the hands of the reverend Dr. Hickes, some part thereof being printed by him, in his preface to the Christian Priesthood." (Add. Notes, p. ii.)

The portion quoted by Hickes has been collated with the MS. at Durham, and the variations (which were unimportant) corrected by it, through the kindness of the editor of Bp. Cosin's Works, Angl. Cath. Library, 1843; who has also identified these notes as Bp. Cosin's, by his marked and beautiful hand-writing. Cosin was librarian to Bp. Overal. There is another interleaved Prayer Book, the notes of which have always been known as Cosin's. (See Nichols, ibid.) The large portions which are translated from Maldonatus de Sacramentis have been marked with single inverted commas.]

[l] [Nichols, ibid., p. 46. col. 1.]

the cross. And this sacrifice which the Church makes (as a sacrifice is taken '*pro mactatione et occisione victimæ*') 'is only commemorative and sacramental[m];' for in that sense Christ only offered it really upon the cross by His own death. And so likewise as it is taken for 'a visible sacrifice,' Christ only offered it; for 'here it is invisible.' But as it is taken for 'a sufficient sacrifice' to take away the sins of the world, so indeed it was offered upon the cross, 'as having power in itself to abolish all sin whatsoever; but it doth not abolish any man's sin for all that, unless it be applied. And the ways to apply it are divers; by faith, by good works, by the unbloody offering up of the same sacrifice, by the receiving of His most precious body and blood. So if we compare the Eucharist with the sacrifice once made upon the cross, with reference to the killing and destroying of the sacrifice, or with reference to the visibility of it, in that sense we call it only a commemorative sacrifice, as the fathers do. But if we compare the Eucharist with Christ's sacrifice made once upon the cross, as concerning the effect

[m] [Nos igitur cum comparamus Eucharistiam cum sacrificio corporis Christi, quod in cruce oblatum est, non negamus degenerare aliquo modo ab illo verissimo sacrificio, si spectentur omnia, quæ in sacrificio esse solent.

Primum enim in sacrificio solebat esse mactatio et occisio victimæ, quæ in cruce reipsa facta est: in Eucharistia non fit, nisi commemoratione et sacramento.

Secundo, in cruce corpus Christi forma visibili oblatum est, in Eucharistia, invisibili.

Tertio, in cruce corpus Christi oblatum est ad sufficientiam, ut dicunt Theologi, id est, tanquam sacrificium habens in se ipso vim abolendi peccata omnium hominum, quamvis non continua abolerentur, nisi sacrificium illud singulis hominibus applicaretur. Quod variis fit modis: per fidem, per charitatem, per bona opera, et per oblationem incruentam ejusdem corporis, item per sumptionem illius. Quapropter cum comparamus Eucharistiam cum sacrificio facto in cruce, habita ratione mactationis et visibilis formæ, vocamus illam sacrificium commemorativum. Et quia fuerunt nonnulli authores, qui existimarunt, verbum sacrificandi concludere in se occisionem (ut revera accidit Græcis, apud quos *θύειν* utrumque significat, et sacrificare et occidere) dixerunt Eucharistiam tantum esse sacrificium commemorativum. Ut D. Chrysost. in Homil. contra Judæos parte 2. [*συγκρινομένη πρὸς ἐκείνην αὕτη ἡ θυσία, κυρίως ἂν λεχθείη μόνη καθαρά· οὐ γὰρ διὰ καπνοῦ καὶ κνίσσης, οὐδὲ δι' αἱμάτων καὶ λύτρων, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος προσάγεται χάριτος.*—Adversus Judæos, Orat. v. (ii. ed. Lat. 1546.) tom. i. p. 648, C. ed. Ben.] Et Magister Sentent., l. 4. dist. 12. ['Ad hoc breviter dici potest, illud quod offertur et consecratur à sacerdote vocari sacrificium et oblationem; quia memoria est et repræsentatio veri sacrificii, et sanctæ immolationis factæ in ara crucis.'] Sed cum hoc dicunt, non negant esse verum sacrificium, sed tantum esse commemorativum, si spectes vim verbi quatenus significat occidere et mactare. Cum autem conferimus Eucharistiam cum illo sacrificio corporis Christi, quod in cruce peractum est, quantum ad effectum, dicimus illud fuisse sacrificium sufficiens, hoc efficiens et applicatorium, utrumque tamen propitiatorium.—Maldonati Disp. circa vii. Sacramenta, tom. i. pp. 322, 323. Lugduni. 1614.]

of it, we say, that that was a sufficient sacrifice; but withal, that it [this?] is a true, real, and efficient sacrifice, and both of them propitiatory[n] for the sins of the whole world.' And therefore in the oblation following we pray, that it may prevail so with God, that we, and all the whole Church of Christ (which consists of more than those that are upon the earth[o]) may receive the benefit of it."

[n] That is, in different senses: the one propitiates as having power, force, and virtue in itself to make propitiation, and the other propitiates, not by any virtue it hath in itself to make propitiation, but in virtue of the sacrifice of Christ. And to this purpose he speaks in his notes on the prayer, after the Communion, "O Lord, and heavenly Father." It may be called a propitiatory sacrifice, not that it makes any propitiation, as that of the cross did, but that it obtains and brings into act that propitiation which was once made by Christ; and so we may speak of prayer, for that is propitiatory too. [The passage in the notes referred to is, "And in this sense it is not only an Eucharistical but a propitiatory sacrifice; and to prove it a sacrifice propitiatory, always so acknowledged by the ancient Church, there can be no better argument, than that it was offered up, not only for the living but for the dead, and for those that were absent, for them that travelled, for Jews, for heretics, &c., who could have no other benefit of it, but as it was a propitiatory sacrifice. And that they did thus offer it see a whole army of fathers apud Mald. de Sacr. p. 342. Nos autem ita comparati sumus, ut cum tam multis et magnis authoribus errare malimus, quam cum Puritanis verum dicere. Not that it makes any propitiation as that of the cross did, but only that it obtains, and brings into act that propitiation which was once made by Christ, and so we may speak of prayer, for that is propitiatory too. Why should we then make any controversy about this? They love not the truth of Christ, nor the peace of the Church, that make these disputes between the Church of Rome and us, when we agree, as Christian Churches should, in our Liturgies. What private men's conceits are, what is that to the public approved religion of either Church, which is to be seen in their Liturgies best of all."—(Nichols' Add. Notes, p. 50. col. 2.) See also the notes on this place previously known as Bp. Cosin's, ibid., p. 51. col. 1.]

[o] This author, as also appears from the notes upon the prayer after the Communion, (see Nichols, ibid.,) did believe the Eucharist to be "a representative sacrifice" of Christ's death upon the cross "for the sins and for the benefit of the whole world, of the whole Church; that both those which are here on earth, and those that rest in the sleep of peace, being departed in the faith of Christ, may find the effect and virtue of it," for this he appeals to the authority of the ancient Church, ["and if the authority of the ancient Church may prevail with us, as it ought to do, there is nothing more manifest than that it always taught as much,"] and in particular cites the words of St. Chrysost. in Matt. viii. "Idcirco altari assistens sacerdos pro his qui ante nos fuerunt, pro universo orbe terrarum, pro absentibus, atque præsentibus, pro his qui postea futuri sunt, sacrificio illo proposito, Deo nos gratias jubet offerre." [*διὸ δὴ καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκουμένης, ὑπὲρ τῶν προτέρων, ὑπὲρ τῶν νῦν, ὑπὲρ τῶν γεννηθέντων τῶν ἔμπροσθεν, ὑπὲρ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ἐσομένων εἰς ἡμᾶς, εὐχαριστεῖν κελεύει, τῆς θυσίας προκειμένης ἐκείνης.*—In Matt. Hom. xxv. al. xxvi. Op., tom. vii. p. 311, A, B. ed. Ben.] Hom. 77. in Johan. "Ideo in mysteriis invicem salutamus, ut multi unum efficiamur et communes pro cæteris [pro non initiatis] preces effundimus, et pro infirmis, et terræ, et maris, et universi orbis finibus [fructibus] sacrificamus." [Hom. lxxviii. al. lxxvii. *διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις ἀσπαζόμεθα ἀλλήλους, ἵνα οἱ πόλλοι γενώμεθα ἕν· καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμυήτων κοίνας ποιούμεθα τὰς εὐχάς, λιτανεύοντες ὑπὲρ νοσούντων, καὶ τῶν κάρπων τῆς οἰκουμένης καὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάττης.* In Joan., tom. viii. p. 464, D. ed. Ben. The Latin is from Erasmus' edition, tom. ii. fol. 56, F; tom. iii. fol. 78, L. Paris. 1546.]

"'Neither do we call[p] this sacrifice of the Eucharist an efficient sacrifice, as if that upon the cross wanted efficacy; but because the force and virtue of that sacrifice would not be profitable unto us, unless it were applied and brought into effect by this Eucharistical sacrifice, and other the holy Sacraments[q], and means appointed by God for that end. But we call it propitiatory, both this and that, because both of them have force and virtue in them to appease God's wrath [against this sinful world, MS.].' Read Maldonat., de Sacrament., p. 323. Therefore this is no new sacrifice, but the same which was once offered, and which is every day offered to God by Christ in heaven, and continued here still on earth by a mystical representation of it in the Eucharist. And the Church intends not to have any new propitiation, or new remission of sins obtained, but to make that effectual, and in act applied to us, which was once obtained by the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross.

[p] [Et non vocamus Eucharistiam sacrificium quantum ad efficientiam, propterea quod sacrificium crucis non fuerit etiam efficax; sed quia vis illius sacrificii non poterat prodesse, et ad efficientiam effectumque redigi, nisi tum per hoc sacrificium, tum per alia sacramenta, tum aliis modis.

Propitiatorium autem ideo dicimus esse utrumque, quia propitiatorium sacrificium esse non est aliud, quam habere vim placandi Deum.—Maldonatus, ibid., p. 323.]

[q] Here he takes Sacraments in the general improper sense of the word, as Calvin, (Instit. Christ. Rel., lib. iv. c. 14. § 20.) "Impositionem manuum, qua Ecclesiæ ministri in suum munus initiantur, ut non invitus patior vocari Sacramentum, ita inter ordinaria Sacramenta non numero." And in the notes on the answer to the question in the Church Catechism, "How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in His Church?" he asserts there are but two Sacraments, in the first and proper acceptation of the word, viz. Baptism and the Lord's Supper. [See Nichols, Add. Notes, p. 59, col. 2. Hickes evidently supposed, as others have done, that the passage he is quoting was originally written by Bp. Overal's chaplain; whereas it now appears to be a translation from Maldonatus; Cosin's object in inserting it, will be seen in the latter part of the extract in brackets in note n, p. 109. The note referred to, after quoting St. Augustine, Ep. 118, says, "Where though St. Augustine may seem to allow more Sacraments than two, . . yet in this sense which our Church propounds (as generally necessary to salvation), Maldonate himself confesseth, that he acknowledgeth no more, (de Sacram., p. 111.) Divus Augustinus (inquit) non de omnibus Sacramentis novis agit illo loco; sed de illis quæ omnibus hominibus communia esse debent ad salutem, &c. That to me it seems strange, there should any controversy be made between our Church and the Church of Rome for the number of the Sacraments; whenas in this sense they acknowledge no more but two, and in a larger sense we acknowledge many more, and more eminently the other five; which though we call not Sacraments ordinarily, and though that general name be gone, yet for the things themselves, their proper names, their true natures, those we preserve inviolable." In Bp. Cosin's other interleaved book (Nichols, ibid., col. 1.) the words occur, "Quanquam enim interdum nomen hoc Sacramenti latius, ut solet et nostris etiam Scriptoribus Reformatis, adhibetur, quando tamen appositè et propriè loquuntur, non nisi duo numerant."]

ADDIT. TESTIMONIES

"Neither is the sacrifice of the cross, as it was once offered up there *modo cruento*, so much remembered in the Eucharist, though it be commemorated, as regard is had to the perpetual and daily offering [of] it by Christ now in heaven, in His everlasting priesthood; and thereupon was, and should be still the *juge sacrificium* observed here on earth, as it is in heaven, the reason which the ancient fathers had for their daily sacrifice. St. Chrysost., in x. ad Hebr. *In Christo semel oblata est hostia ad salutem potens. Quid ergo nos?* [*Nonne*] *per singulos dies offerimus? et si quotidie offerimus, ad recordationem ejus oblationis fit*[r]. St. August., de Civ. D. lib. x. *Ipse sacerdos, et ipsa oblatio, cujus rei sacramentum quotidianum esse voluit ecclesiæ sacrificium*[s]." So in the thanksgiving after the Lord's Prayer upon these words, "To accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving[t]."

"So the ancient fathers were wont to call this sacrifice, *sacrificium laudis et gratiarum actionis;* not exclusively, as if it were no other sacrifice but that; for they call it also *sacrificium commemorationis*, and *sacrificium spiritus*, and *sacrificium obsequii*, &c.; and which is more, *sacrificium verum et propitiatorium.* All other ways but this, the Eucharist, or any other sacrifice we make, are improperly, *et secundum quamdam similitudinem*, called sacrifices. 'The true and proper nature of a sacrifice is[u], to be an oblation[1] of some real and sensible thing[2], made only to God[3], for the acknowledging of man's subjection to God[4], and of His supreme dominion over man, made by a lawful ministry[5], and performed by certain mysterious rites and ceremonies[6], which Christ and His Church have ordained.

"'[1] When we say it is 'an oblation' we say two things; 1st, that the true nature and essence of a sacrifice consists only,

[r] [τὸ μὲν οὖν προσφέρεσθαι, ἔλεγχος ἁμαρτημάτων· τὸ δὲ ἀεὶ, ἔλεγχος ἀσθενείας. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοὐναντίον· ἅπαξ προσηνέχθη, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἀεὶ ἤρκεσε. . . . . τί οὖν; ἡμεῖς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν οὐ προσφέρομεν; προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ. —S. Chrysost. In Epist. ad Hebræos, cap. x. hom. 17. Op., tom. xii. p. 168, A, D.]

[s] [Per hoc et sacerdos est, ipse offerens, ipse et oblatio. Cujus rei Sacramentum quotidianum esse voluit Ecclesiæ sacrificium, quæ cum ipsius capitis corpus sit, se ipsam per ipsum discit offerre.—S. August. De Civ. Dei, lib. x. c. 20. Op., tom. vii. p. 256, B. ed. Ben.]

[t] [Nichols, p. 49. col. 2.]

[u] [Sacrificium est oblatio sensibilis rei sensibilis facta soli Deo, ad agnitionem humanæ infirmitatis et naturæ, et ad professionem divinæ majestatis a legitimo ministro, ritu aliquo mystico. Cum oblationem vocamus, duo significare volumus. Primum, non in alia re

tanquam in genere, in the offering of it; and therefore we do not say that the killing of the thing to be sacrificed, or any other ceremony to be used about it, is a sacrifice; for that is, and ever was called the sacrifice which belonged to the priest's office alone; now the Levites might kill the sacrifice, but none could offer it except the priest: *oblatio ergo est genus sacrificii.*

"'2ndly, that every offering is not called a sacrifice, but every sacrifice is an offering; for there were many things which private men came to offer, as first-fruits, &c., which were not called sacrifices.

"'[2] When we say it is an oblation 'of some sensible thing,' it is to shew that every act of our religion, whereby we profess our subjection unto God, is not properly called a sacrifice in Scripture; for we profess that, by confessing of our sins, by prayer, by praise, &c., which are no proper sacrifices.

"'[3] As a part of that worship which is 'only due to God,' &c. Exod. xxii. [20] there is a command, that no sacrifice be made but only to God alone;' and it is so His due, that without it we hardly acknowledge Him to be our God. And for that reason we profess it here in this offertory" (or Eucharistical passage), "that it is our bounden duty and service so to do. 'Therefore as there never was, nor could be any religion without a God, so there never was, nor can be any without sacrifice, being one of the chiefest acts whereby we profess our religion to Him that we serve.

naturam et essentiam sacrificii consistere, tanquam in genere, nisi in oblatione. Quare nec mactationem victimæ, neque ullam aliam ceremoniam, sacrificium vocamus: quia Scriptura oblationem appellat sacrificium, non mactationem. Nam id nominat sacrificium, quod solus faciebat sacerdos; solus sacerdos offerebat victimam, ministri mactabant. Sola ergo oblatio in Scripturis significatur esse proprium genus sacrificii. Alterum est, non omnem oblationem sacrificium vocari; tamen omne sacrificium dici oblationem in Scriptura. Offerebant enim multa etiam homines privati, ut elemosynas, primitias; sed non vocabantur sacrificia.

.... Cum dicimus, esse rei sensibilis, volumus indicare non omnem actum religionis, quo profitemur nostram subjectionem, et agnoscimus Numen, vocari sacrificium proprie in Scriptura. Nam id facimus etiam per confessionem, per Psalmodiam, per orationem, sed hæc in Scriptura non dicuntur proprie sacrificia. Cum addimus, facta soli Deo, volumus docere sacrificium esse unum actum externum ex illis, quos habet illa species religionis, quæ debetur soli Deo, quoque proprio nomine vocatur Latria ..... fuit prohibitum Exod. 22. ne quis sacrificaret alii, quam soli Domino. Quamobrem sicut religio nulla fuit unquam, neque esse potuit sine Deo: ita esse non potuit sine sacrificio: quia unus actus est, quo maxime religionem profitemur.

ADDIT. TESTIMONIES.

"'[4] The end of all sacrifices; for though every sacrifice had some especial end whereunto it was made, yet there was none of them all that had not this for their general aim and scope.

"'[5] To exclude many private offerings, which in Scripture are called sacrifices, but not properly.

"'[6] The general form of a sacrifice, which consisted always in some ceremonious offering of it, the better to express the mystery contained in it, and therefore tenths and first-fruits, though they were offered unto God, yet because they were not offered *ritu mystico*, they were no proper sacrifices.

"'But those which were properly called sacrifices were three ways distinguished: (1.) in matter. (2.) in form. And (3.) in the end.

"'(1.) In matter, either when the thing to be offered was alive, and then it was called *victima*, or *res solida*, but not *viva;* and it was called *immolatio*, (as the heathens[1] were wont to call their sacrifices *immolationes, a mola*, or *a molendo*,) or *res liquida*, and it was called *libamentum*.

[1] [Third edition, "Fathers."]

"'And besides these, we find in Scripture seven appellations of a sacrifice by way of analogy only, but not truly and properly.

"'(2.) In form, either when all the sacrifice was consumed by fire, and it was called *holocaustum;* or part of it by fire'" (and part by the priest) "'and it was called *hostia pacifica*.

Cum dicimus fieri in agnitionem humanæ subjectionis, et professionem divinæ majestatis, declaramus finem omnium sacrificiorum. Nam etsi erant alii fines speciales singulorum sacrificiorum; tamen sacrificium nullum erat, quod non hoc generaliter spectaret. Cum dicimus, esse oblationem factam a legitimo ministro, excludimus multas oblationes privatas, quæ vocantur in Scriptura sacrificia, ut elemosynæ et primitiæ. Cum dicimus fieri debere ritu mystico, declaramus generalem formam sacrificii, quæ semper consistit in aliqua ceremonia habente aliquid mysterii, sicut erat illa in sacrificio pro peccato, ut sacerdos imponeret manus super caput victimæ. . . . . Quapropter hac etiam de causa decimæ et primitiæ, etiam si Deo offerebantur, quia tamen non offerebantur Deo operatione mystica, non erant proprie sacrificia. Ea autem quæ proprie dicebantur sacrificia, tribus modis distinguebantur, materia, forma, et fine. Materia, aut quia id quod conferebatur, erat res viva, et vocabatur victima; aut res solida, sed non viva, ut cum offerebatur simila, sal, et alia hujusmodi, quæ proprie dicebantur immolationes: sicuti etiam apud prophanos authores hujusmodi sacrificia a mola vel a molendo immolationes appellabantur. Aut quod offerebatur, erat res liquida, ut vinum, et cætera, et hæc proprie dicebantur libamenta. Præter hæc reperimus in sacris literis, septem modis dici sacrificium improprie, et per analogiam proprii ac veri sacrificii. Forma autem distinguebantur sacrificia: quia aliquando tota res, quæ offerebatur, consumebatur igni, et vocabatur holocaustum; aliquando pars una igne absumebatur, par altera edebatur a sacerdotibus, quod fiebat in sacrificio pro peccato; aliquando una

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. III.

"'(3.) In the end, either when it was offered in recognition [for the profession, MS.] of God's supreme dominion; and then it was called *holocaustum*, which was all burned, to signify that it was all and wholly from God, whatsoever man enjoyed; or for the obtaining of the remission of sins, and it was called the sin-offering; or for thanksgiving after victory, &c., and it was called *hostia pacifica*. Therefore because the chief and general end of every sacrifice was, to acknowledge God's majesty and dominion over the world, hence it is that every act almost which did but shew so much as that, was called in Scripture a sacrifice, in analogy to the other. As, 1. when men submit themselves to God in their souls; so Psalm li. [17], a broken spirit is a sacrifice to God. 2. When men offered up their bodies as lively sacrifices, Rom. xii. 1, by keeping them pure, and clean from sin. 3. By taming and afflicting the body, Heb. xi. [Wisd. iii. 6.] *tanquam holocausti hostiam accepit eos.* 4. By words, *immola Deo sacrificium laudis, vitulos labiorum.* 5. By works of mercy, Heb. xiii. [16], for with these [for all which, MS.] sacrifices God is well pleased. 6. The whole giving of a man's self up to God, Rom. xv. [16], Phil. ii. [17.] 7. The profession of all ministerial functions in divine things,

[Ps. 50. 14.]

[Hosea 14. 3.]

pars incendebatur, altera edebatur a sacerdotibus, tertia ab iis, qui hostiam obtulerant, ut in sacrificio quod vocabatur hostia pacifica. Fine autem differebant sacrificia etiam tribus modis: quia aliquando non in aliam finem offerebantur, quam in agnitionem divinæ majestatis, ut Holocaustum, quod propterea totum comburebatur, ut significaretur, totum esse Dei quicquid boni habent homines: aliquando ad obtinendam remissionem peccatorum, quod aliquando vocabatur Peccatum, absolute, aliquando sacrificium pro peccato: aliquando etiam offerebatur sacrificium in gratiarum actionem, post adeptam victoriam, vel aliam rem prospere gestam, atque hæc vocabatur hostia pacifica. . . . . .

Ergo, quia quod præcipue efficiebatur in omni proprio sacrificio, id erat, ut homines agnoscerent suam infirmitatem et divinam potentiam; factum est, ut id omne, quo illud idem quoquo modo efficiebatur, sacrificium vocaretur in Scriptura. Fit autem hoc primum, cum animo homines sese submittunt Deo, ideo 'Spiritus contribulatus' vocatur sacrificium. Secundo fit corpore, quando continetur ne labatur in ea vitia, ad quæ quis proclivis est. Quapropter aliquando sacrificium vocatur continentia corporis, ut ad Roman. 12. 'Obsecro vos, ut exhibeatis corpora vestra hostiam viventem.' Tertio fit corpore domando et affligendo, propterea omne martyrium et omnis corporis castigatio dicitur sacrificium ad Hebr. 11. [Sap. iii. 6.] 'Tanquam holocausti hostiam accepit eos.' Quarto, id ipsum fit verbis, sicuti cum profitemur Deum esse omnium rerum bonarum largitorem. Quare oratio vocalis, hymni, et laudes vocantur sacrificium, juxta illud: 'Immola Deo sacrificium laudis.' Et: 'hostiam vociferationis reddam tibi.' Et: 'reddemus vitulos labiorum nostrorum,' inquit Oseas. Quinto, hoc profitemur operibus pertinentibus ad corpus, sicuti eleemosynis, ideo eleemosynas vocat hostias D. Paulus ad Hebr. 13. 'His enim hostiis promeretur Deus.' Sexto, integra declaratio hominis Deo facto et corpore et animo dicitur sacrificium, sicut conversio gentium apud D. Paulum ad Rom. 15. et ad Philippens. 2. Sep-

ADDIT. TESTIMONIES.

because by that service men profess themselves to be subjects and servants unto God, Rom. xv. [31], *obsequii mei oblationem.*

"'Now the Eucharist, though by way of analogy it [may] be called a sacrifice, many of these ways, yet the true and real nature of it in the offertory, is to acknowledge God's majesty and our misery[x], and to appease His wrath towards us, to get blessings from Him, to make Christ's bloody sacrifice effectual unto us.' See the notes upon this word in the form of consecration before."

"So[y] that though it may [analogically] be called a sacrifice most of the seven ways, yet formally and truly it may be called a sacrifice also, in the very natural signification of a sacrifice, for ought I know any harm should come on't[z]; yet not in the strictness and rigour of speech; for so was there never any sacrifice, nor ever shall be any but Christ's alone. See the exposition of the place in Malachi, *apud Maldon. de Euch.*[a] p. 326, and of Ps. cx.[b] *Tu es Sacerdos*, &c. both which the ancient fathers, with one consent, understood of the sacrifice of the Eucharist, and the priests of the gospel."

The definition of a sacrifice which is here given, is not, as mine is[c], a definition of sacrifice in the most general sense, as it is common to all sorts of sacrifices, of any religion, true or false, by what rites, in what manner soever offered, but a particular definition of an oblation, made only to the true God, by the hands of a lawful minister, whether it were, or were not, "consumed in whole, or in part, upon the altar[d]" by fire, effusion, or sprinkling, which were but the rites

timo, omnis professio et functio divini muneris ita appellatur: quia ea etiam ratione homines profitentur, se esse ministros et servos Dei. Quocirca Paulus ad Rom. 15. vocavit 'obsequii sui oblationem.'—Maldonatus, ibid., pp. 319—322.]

[x] [Third edition, "one mystery."]

[y] These words are in the margin of the original, 'The people may offer it up all the improper ways; none but the priest can offer it, as it is a proper sacrifice.'

[z] [The clauses "yet not, &c." and "yet formally, &c." are transposed in the third edition, and the last words altered to "for ought I know of any may come thereby." The passage has been corrected from the MS.]

[a] [Maldonatus, ibid., p. 326.]

[b] [Id. ibid., pp. 198, 328.]

[c] ["A sacrifice" (i. e. the res oblata) "is a gift brought, and solemnly offered by a priest, ordinary or extraordinary, according to the rites and observances of any religion, in, before, at, or upon any place, unto any god, to honour and worship him and thereby to acknowledge him to be God and Lord."—Christian Priesthood, c. ii. sect. 10.]

[d] See Christian Priesthood, ibid.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. III.

attending some sort of sacrifices among the Jews, but not all. And as according to this definition, the author of it hath proved the Eucharist to be a real sacrifice, so the ministers of it must be real priests. It is also to be observed, that his distinction between an oblation and a sacrifice is in effect the same with theirs[e], who, according to the Hebrew word *Corban*, making sacrifice and oblation equivalent terms, then divide sacrifice, as a genus, into its species, of which a sacrifice offered by a priest to God upon a table or altar, with certain rites and ceremonies, is one, and one of the most solemn sort.

SECT. IV. Imputation of priestcraft answered.

And now I hope, by these additional authorities, and those cited in my book, and in the Appendix to it, I shall convince the late writer[f] I have spoken of in the beginning of my first letter, that the Eucharist is a proper sacrifice, and that we who offer it are proper priests, and that there can be no danger in this doctrine, which was taught and practised by all the ancient Catholic Church. I hope also what I have said here, and in that letter, will sufficiently refute and expose the incomparable presumption of the author of the Rights, who[g] represents the whole notion of the Lord's Supper, as I have shewed it was taught in the primitive times, for priestcraft, saying, that "they [the clergy] made it a mystery in the heathenish sense of that word, and for heathenish reasons, that they might have the same power as the priests of idols had, to exclude whom they were pleased to term unworthy." He ridicules the notion of consecration[h], as invented by the fathers, to 'produce the real presence, and make the Eucharist a real sacrifice, and the ministers real priests, and the communion table an altar:' and saith[i], that "among Christians, one no more than another, can be reckoned a priest from Scripture," and that "there is no more reason to affirm, that the minister offers up the people's prayers, than they his; except it can be supposed that God hears him only, who talks the loudest, in that he is the

[e] [Outram de Sacrificiis, lib. i. cap. viii. § 1, 2. p. 82.]

[f] [The author of A Second Defence of the Church of England from the charge of Schism and Heresy. London, 1698. See Christian Priesthood, chap. i. sect. 1.]

[g] [Rights, chap. iii.] pp. 101, 102, &c.

[h] [Rights, chap. iii.] p. 102. [Hickes substitutes "the Eucharist" for "the Lord's Supper," which Tindal had used.]

[i] [Rights, chap. iii. p. 108.]

servant of the congregation." And, "the clerk has as good a title to the priesthood as the parson; since the people join with him in offering up their sacrifices of spiritual songs, hymns, and thanksgivings." CHARGE OF PRIEST-CRAFT.

This is a heavy charge of heathenish knavery and priest-craft upon all the ancient fathers, as well those who lived with the Apostles, as those who lived not long after them, who, as it were, with one voice taught the holy Eucharist to be a sacrifice, as I have shewed in the first letter. They are all included in this impudent charge of 'heathenish priest-craft,' and perhaps, if he durst, he would have laid it upon the Apostle, as well as by consequence upon his fellow labourer St. Clement; for he spoke of the holy Eucharist after the same 'heathenish manner' as he will have it, in sacrificial terms; for such are not only 'altar[k],' both in the literal and figurative sense for an 'altar-offering,' but the 'Lord's table,' and the 'Lord's Supper;' for antiquaries know, that it was the custom among the Greeks after sacrifice was ended, to make a feast, and that for that purpose there were tables set up in the temples. Hence "the words[l], [*Epulari, comedere,* and the like,] which express 'eating,' and 'drinking,' and 'feasting,' are often used [sometimes put] for sacrificing, as in Virgil's Æneid, lib. iv. [206.] [Heb. 13. 10.] [1 Cor. 10. 21; 11. 20.]

> *Jupiter omnipotens, cui nunc Maurusia pictis*
> *Gens epulata toris, lenæum libat honorem*[m].

Hence the gods are said to feast with men, Odyss. η.[n] and Jupiter, and the rest of the gods are said to go to feast in Ethiopia[o]." And in the Old Testament, these heathenish sacrificial words and phrases, are often used by the holy penmen, as in the prophet Ezekiel, where the just man is said to be one "who had not eaten upon the mountains, nor lift up his eyes to the idols." And in Exodus, "to go into the ch. 18. 6. ch. 3. 18; 5. 1.

[k] See [ch. ii. sect. 6, 7, of] the first Letter.

[l] Dr. Potter's Archæologia Græca, vol. i. book ii. chap. 4.

[m] [chap. ii.] § ix. of the Christian Priesthood asserted.

[n] [Αἰεὶ γὰρ καὶ πάρος γε θεοὶ φαίνονται ἐναργεῖς
Ἡμῖν, εὖθ' ἕρδωμεν ἀγακλειτὰς ἑκατόμβας·
Δαίνυνταί τε πὰρ ἄμμι καθήμενοι ἔνθαπερ ἡμεῖς.
Odyss. vii. 202—204.]

[o] [Ζεὺς γὰρ ἐπ' Ὠκέανον μετ' ἀμύμονας Αἰθιοπῆας
Χθιζὸς ἔβη μετὰ δαῖτα· Θεοὶ δ' ἅμα πάντες ἕποντο.
Iliad i. 423, 424.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. IV.

wilderness to sacrifice to the Lord," and "to hold a feast to Him there," signify the same thing. And the sacrifice to the golden calf is described after this manner: "When Aaron saw it, he built an altar before it, and made proclamation, saying, to-morrow is a feast to the Lord. And they rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt-offerings, and brought peace-offerings, and the people sat down to eat and to drink, (upon the peace-offerings) and rose up to play." Eating of the sacrifices, or sacrificial entertainments, were common to all religions, Patriarchal, Jewish, and Gentile; and therefore, when God commanded the Israelites to destroy the altars of the inhabitants of the land, He said, "Thou shalt worship no other god, for the Lord, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and [they] go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice to them, and one call thee, and thou eat of their sacrifice." I have shewed, that it was in a parallel between the sacrificial eating of pagans in the temples of their gods, and that of the Christians in their churches, that the Apostle said[p], "Ye cannot drink of the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils, ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and the table of devils." Here the holy Apostle is involved in his indictment of 'priestcraft,' and making the Eucharist a mystery in the heathenish sense of the word, as well as in calling it the 'Lord's Supper;' for the word supper, or feast, or any other word for eating and drinking that relates to any god, or temple, is a sacrificial term. So in Julius Pollux[q], the heathenish banquets, in honour of their gods, are called *ἱερὰ δεῖπνα*, "holy suppers," and the sacrificial feasts, in honour of Hecate, are called her *δόρποι*, or suppers. And in sober truth, were every thing to be branded for heathenish, that was common to the religions of the Heathens, Jews, and Christians; not only the names of 'mystery,' 'sacrifice,' 'priest,' and 'altar,' which these monsters of Christians represent to the world, as all borrowed from heathenism

Exod. 32. 5, 6.

Exod. 34. 14, 15.

[1 Cor. 10. 21.]

[p] See sect. ix. of the first Letter. [Christian Priesthood, chap. ii. sect. ix. 1.]

[q] [*ὅστις χρῆσθαι βούλοιτο τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίως ῥηθέντι ἐπὶ τῆς μάκτρας, ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς τὰ ἱερὰ δεῖπνα, ἢ τὰ πρὸς θυσίαν φερούσης, ὡς παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ εἴρηται, Ἑκαταίας μαγίδας δόρπων.*— Julii Pollucis Onomasticon, lib. x. § 81. vol. ii. pp. 228, 229. ed. G. Dindorf. Lips. 1824.]

CHARGE OF PRIEST-CRAFT.

by crafty Christian priests; but the names of 'God,' and 'heaven,' and 'religion,' and 'worship,' and 'temple,' must be reproached for heathenish too. Nay, the notion of future rewards and punishments, and of the immortality of the soul, and whatsoever else the Christian apologists[r] observe, to have been, in any kind or degree, common to the Greeks and Christians, must be blemished, as heathenish inventions of Christian priests; as baptism for the mystical washing away of sin; the mediatory office of our blessed Lord, and the eternal generation of the λόγος, must also be branded for a Christian travesty of the fable of Pallas, the heathen goddess of wisdom, who was said to be begotten, and conceived in, and born of, Jupiter's brain. The Lord's Supper of the bread and the cup, may, at this impudent and blaspheming way of reasoning, be ridiculed as an heathenish invention, borrowed from the priests of Mithra[s]; and so, according to these blasphemers, our blessed Lord and Redeemer, "the Catholic Priest of the Father[t], through whom we offer up our Eucharistical sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," must also come in, with all His ministerial priests, from the Apostles to our times, for His share of 'priestcraft.'

I cannot but observe how the Rights, in the place before cited, calls the Eucharist 'the Lord's Supper,' and not 'the Sacrament,' or 'Sacrament of the Lord's Supper;' because, as I suppose, he knew that Sacrament, which was the term of the Latin Church for it, signifies mystery, and answers to the Greek word μυστήριον, and that, as the Greek Church always called it the Holy Mystery, so the Latins called it the Holy Sacrament, of the body and blood of Christ. And as a religious mystery is so called, in a sense common to heathens

[r] [See notes, p. 123.]

[s] See Justin Martyr's first Apology, published by Dr. Grabe at Oxford, in 8vo. § lxxxvi. p. 130, with his notes on ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Μίθρα μυστηρίοις. [See his Spicilegium SS. Patrum, &c., tom. i. sect. 11. notæ pp. 239, sqq. The passage in S. Justin M. is, ὅπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Μίθρα μυστηρίοις παρέδωκαν γίνεσθαι μιμησάμενοι οἱ πονηροὶ δαίμονες· ὅτι γὰρ ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος τίθεται ἐν ταῖς τοῦ μυουμένου τελεταῖς μετ' ἐπιλόγων τινῶν, ἢ ἐπίστασθε, ἢ μαθεῖν δύνασθε.—c. 66. p. 83, C. Op., ed. Ben. 1742.]

[t] [Offerre debere munus Deo apud templum, orationem scilicet et actionem gratiarum apud ecclesiam, per Christum Jesum catholicum Patris sacerdotem. —Tert. Adv. Marcion., lib. iv. c. 9. Op., p. 420, A.]

[Agere autem Deo gratias, hoc est sacrificium laudis offerre: et ideo addit, Per Jesum Christum velut per Pontificem magnum. Oportet enim scire eum qui vult offerre sacrificium Deo, quod per manus pontificis debet offerre.—Origen in Ep. ad Rom., lib. i. § 9. Op., tom. iv. p. 468, C.]

and Christians, because it exhibits one thing to the outward senses and another to the understanding; so, in most eminent manner, the Church always called Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, mysteries, because they were outward, visible, holy signs of a secret religious signification, which none but Christians, or Christian catechumens, understood, and therefore, if one of these mysteries is a creature of priestcraft, "in a heathenish sense, and for heathenish reasons," the other is so too.

I cannot but observe how craftily this accuser of the clergy, without any distinction of times or persons, lays the charge of priestcraft equally on all Christian priests of all ages, as if there were no difference between the more primitive and pure, and the latter and corrupt, ages of the Church, or between reformed Churches, and those which remain unreformed. "Nothing," saith he[u], "would expose priestcraft more, than an historical account how, and upon what motives, the clergy varied in their notions and practices concerning the Lord's Supper. As first, how they made it a mystery, in the heathenish sense of that word, and for heathenish reasons." Here is no difference made between the Apostles, and the apostolical Churches and clergy, and those which varied from the apostolical doctrines and practice; no distinction of heretical or schismatical churches and clergy, from the truly catholic, or of the ages of pure light and truth, from those of darkness, error, and ignorance; but, for once to use a vulgar proverb, he shakes the clergy of all centuries in a bag together, and that priest which is first taken out, though he were an Apostle, or apostolic priest, though he were never so holy a martyr, or confessor, be he who he will, or of what Church or age soever, he must be no better than an idol-priest, a mere priestcraft villain and knave, who of making the Eucharist a mystery and sacrifice, and himself a sacrificer, afterwards presumed to make it a God[x]. This is a fallacy runs almost through the whole book of the Rights, and, at this impudent way of arguing, he may turn all the doctrines of Christianity into priestcraft. "Nothing," may a man say,

[u] [Rights of the Christian Church, chap. iii. p. 101.]

[x] ["And then nothing less would satisfy them than making the great God, who made all things."—Ibid., chap. iii. p. 103.]

CHARGE OF PRIEST-CRAFT.

"would expose priestcraft more than an historical account, how, and for what motives, the clergy varied in their notions and practices concerning" Church government. "As first, how they set up men called apostles, and then bishops, and priests, and deacons, in the heathenish sense of the words, and for heathenish reasons, who had arch-priests, priests, and inferior ministers, who usurped power over the people, and excluded whom they would, as unworthy; and, as the heathens had one sovereign pontiff over all their arch-priests, and priests, so the clergy, to magnify their power, were never quiet, till the more effectually to enslave the people, in a most heathenish manner, and for heathenish reasons, they set up another Pontifex Maximus at Rome." So it may be said in this blasphemous way, "Nothing would expose priestcraft more than an historical account, how, and for what motives, the clergy varied in their notions concerning Jesus of Nazareth, as first, how they made Him a prophet, then a king, and at last, in a heathenish manner, and for heathenish reasons, a sovereign pontiff, and demon-like mediator[y] betwixt God and man, that in His name they may get the same power over the people, as the idol-priests had, and exclude whom they would, as unworthy." Nay, might he not falsely say, they were never quiet, till of an inferior ministerial sort of God, under the one supreme God, as they first taught Him to be, they met together, and made and determined Him to be an essential God, very God of very God, of one substance with the Almighty Father, equal to the supreme God, to exalt their power, by a pretended spiritual authority under Him, in a 'heathenish manner,' not only over the people, but over senates and kings.

I must also observe, with what assurance this doughty champion, and penman of the club, derives the Christian notion of sacrifice, priest, and altar, by priestcraft from the

[y] See the History of Religion, [pp. 287—298, of the reprint appended to the reprint of the Growth of Deism, 1709. "It may now be proper to shew the several distinctions of Gods, and Divine powers, and the uses of them: whereby it will further appear, how the priestcraft contrived notions and opinions, to engage people to submit implicitly to their directions. . . . Demons, in the theology of the Gentiles, were reckoned of as an inferior sort of divine powers . . . and it was held, that these were constituted between the superior Gods and men, to mediate and to reconcile them, the superior celestial Gods being supposed so august and pure, as not to be profaned or approached with the immediate care of earthly things."]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. IV.

heathens, contrary to the known original, and first propagation of the Christian religion from the Jewish Church, and among the Jews. Did he not know that the blessed Founder of it was a Jew, and all His Apostles Jews, who were versed in the Scriptures, and religious rites and customs of the Jews? Did he not know that Christianity is nothing but mystical, or reformed, Judaism, and that our Lord Himself used the words 'altar,' 'gift,' or sacrifice, and offering, in a precept to His disciples[z]? and did He borrow them from the heathens, or from the Jewish Church? Did St. Paul, who was an Hebrew of the Hebrews, as touching the law a Pharisee, and conversant in Moses and the prophets, and in their temple worship; did he, I say, who was versed in the Greek, as well as the Hebrew Testament, borrow the word *θυσιαστήριον*, 'altar,' from the heathen, or from the Hellenistical writers[a], who so carefully used this word both in their versions of the Old Testament, and their other writings, in distinction from *βωμὸς*, which the heathens used for the altars of their gods. But because 'heathen' and 'heathenish' will make a terrible sound in the ears of some readers, and raise odious ideas, with fears

[Matt. 5. 23, 24.]

[Heb. 13. 10.]

[z] [See The Christian Priesthood, chap. ii. sect. vi.]

[a] As in Numb. xxiii. 1. [*βωμοὺς*, LXX, aras, Vulg." So] ver. 14, 29, 30. Amos vii. 9. [*βωμοὶ*, excelsa,] 1 Macc. i. 47. [*βωμοὺς*, Vulg. v. 50. aras,] ver. 54. [*ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον . . . βωμοὺς*. Vulg. v. 57. Super altare Dei . . . aras.] ver. 59. [*θυσιάζοντες ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν, ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*. Vulg. v. 62. sacrificabant super aram quæ erat contra altare]. ibid., c. ii. 23. [*βωμοὺς*, aras. So] ver. 25, 45. cap. v. 68. 2 Macc. x. 2, 3. [*θυσιαστήριον*, altare.] And this distinction was so generally observed betwixt *θυσιαστήριον* and *βωμὸς*, that the former is but once used for the altar of an idol in the LXXII. 1 Kings (Βασιλ Γ) xviii. 26. [*διέτρεχον ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*, transiliebantque altare], and the latter by no Hellenistical writer for the altar of God, but the author of the second book of Maccabees, who gentilizes in his style, ch. i. 19. [*λάβοντες ἀπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*, acceptum ignem de altari, (this is said of the altar of God,)] xiii. 8. [*βωμὸν*, aram Dei.] The same distinction is observed between altare and ara throughout the Latin vulgar Bible, and all the Latin fathers, except Tertullian. [See Christian Priesthood, chap. ii. sect. 6. § 3.

The one passage, 1 Kings xviii. 26, is far from being the only instance in which *θυσιαστήριον* is used by the LXX for the altar of an idol. It is so used Jud. ii. 2, and vi. 25—32, where it occurs five times. (Vulg. ara, in all). 3 Reg. xvi. 32, (Vulg. ara,) 4 Reg. xi. 19, (Vulg. ara,) xvi. 10, (Vulg. altare,) xxi. 3, 4, (aras,) 5, (altaria,) xxiii. 12, (altaria, twice,) 2 Par. xiv. 3, (altaria, as also) xxiii. 17, xxviii. 24, xxx. 14, xxxiii. 4, (aras, as also) 5, 15, xxxiv. 4, 5, (altaria,) Ezek. vi. 4—13, (aras, as also) Hos. viii. 11, x. 1—8, xii. 11, (altaria). In 3 Reg. xiii., 4 Reg. xxiii., Amos iii. 14, *θυσιαστήριον* is used of the altar at Bethel. On the other hand, in Josh. xxiii. 10, sqq. (except ver. 28,) *βωμὸς* (but Vulg. altare,) is used of the altar erected by the Transjordanic tribes, which is contrasted (ver. 19) with *θυσιαστήριον*, the altar in the tabernacle. Beside the passages noted by Hickes, ara is used for the altar of the true God, Ecclus. l. 13, 15, (LXX, *βωμὸς*,) Baruch i. 10, (LXX, *θυσιαστήριον*.)]

CHARGE OF PRIEST CRAFT.

and jealousies in their minds, therefore whatever Christianity hath in common with the religions of the Jews and heathens, it must be all 'heathenish,' and for 'heathenish reasons;' its 'priests,' and 'sacrifice,' and 'altars,' its 'excommunications,' the mediation, and high-priesthood of its Redeemer, must be represented as heathenish, and, if he durst, he might have represented every thing in the Jewish religion as heathenish too. But that was too bold a stroke at first, but hereafter perhaps they may arrive at that confidence, unless Josephus against Apion[b], and the Christian apologists[c], and Cyril[d] of Alexandria's answer to Julian the apostate, should stand in their way, who have shewed that the Greeks were but boys and children to the Hebrews, and that, like plagiaries, they borrowed all their learning, sacred and profane, relating to law or religion, from them. Indeed paganism, as learned men have often shewed[e], is but Judaism, corrupted from the service of one true God to the worship of devils; and, as I must observe again, if every thing in the Christian religion, whereof there is the like among pagans, must pass for heathenish priestcraft, there will be but very little left, which must not pass for such too. Wherefore when these blasphemers say, that such or such a notion or practice in the Christian religion was introduced by priestcraft from the heathens, it should be considered, whether the heathens did

[b] [Πυθαγόρας τοίνυν ὁ Σάμιος ἀρχαῖος ὢν, σοφίᾳ δὲ καὶ τῇ περὶ τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείᾳ, πάντων ὑπειλημμένος διενεγκεῖν τῶν φιλοσοφησάντων, οὐ μόνον ἐγνωκὼς τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν δῆλός ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ζηλωτὴς αὐτῶν ἐκ πλείστου γεγενημένος.—Flav. Josephi, contra Apionem, lib. i. c. 22. Op., tom. ii. p. 1345, ll. 19—23.]

[c] [πάντα ὅσα περὶ ἀθανασίας ψυχῆς, ἢ τιμωριῶν τῶν μετὰ θάνατον, ἢ θεωρίας οὐρανίων, ἢ τῶν ὁμοίων δογμάτων, καὶ φιλόσοφοι καὶ ποιηταὶ ἔφασαν, παρὰ τῶν προφητῶν τὰς ἀφορμὰς λαβόντες, καὶ νοῆσαι δεδύνηνται, καὶ ἐξηγήσαντο. —S. Justini Martyris, Apologia i. c. 44. Op., p. 70, A.]

[d] [εἶτα πρὸς τούτῳ καταδεικνύομεν Μωσέα μὲν ἐν χρόνῳ τὰ πρεσβεῖα λαχόντα, καὶ δόξαν ὀρθὴν καὶ ἀπλανεστάτην περὶ τῆς ἀῤῥήτου καὶ ἀνωτάτω πασῶν οὐσίας εἰσκεκομικότα, καὶ κοσμοποιΐας ἄριστα μνημονεύσαντα καὶ νόμων τῶν εἰς εὐσέβειαν καὶ δικαιοσύνην οὐ ἀθαύμαστον βραβευτὴν, τοὺς δὲ παρ' αὐτοῖς [sc. Ἕλλησι] ὠνομασμένους σοφοὺς, γεγονότας μὲν ὑστάτους καὶ νεωτάτους, κεκλοφότας δὲ τὰ ἐκείνου, καὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις λόγοις ἐγκατακλώσαντας, εἰ καὶ μὴ εἰς ἅπαν ὑγιῶς ἰσχύσαι τε μόλις καὶ δόξαν ἁρπάσαι σεμνοπρεπῆ, καί τι τῶν ἀληθῶν ἐοικέναι λέγειν.—S. Cyrilli, Op., tom. vi. Contra Julianum, lib. i. p. 7, D, E.

καὶ μὴν καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀρίστωνος Πλάτων ἐν τῷ Τιμαίῳ φησὶ, Σόλωνα τὸν Ἀθήνῃσιν ἀφικέσθαι μὲν εἰς τὴν Αἰγυπτιάν· πυθέσθαι δέ τινος τῶν αὐτόθι ψευδοπροφητῶν, ἤγουν ἱερέων, λέγοντος· ὦ Σόλων, Σόλων, Ἕλληνες ἐστὲ παῖδες ἀεί· γέρων δὲ Ἕλλην οὐκ ἔστι, νέοι τε τὰς ψυχὰς ἅπαντες, οὐδεμίαν γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἔχετε παλαιὰν δόξαν.—Id. ibid., p. 15, B, C.]

[e] [e. g. Theophilus Gale in his Court of the Gentiles, 4to. 1672—78, and Huetius in his Demonstratio Evangelica, fol. 1679, and, with a preface defending it, 1690.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. IV.

not derive it from the Jews, or whether it is not a thing common to all religions, and good in itself, though more or less perverted and abused by the heathens; nay, I will add one thing more, it ought to be considered, whether it is unlawful for Christians, or Christian priests, to borrow a proper term or good custom from paganism, or to reform and turn that to the honour and service of the true God, which they abused in the worship of the false gods. Brissonius[f], in his Formulæ, hath shewed that the ancient and common phrase in the Christian worship, *Κύριε ἐλέησον*, 'Lord have mercy upon us,' was one of the formulæ of invocation in the solemn worship at heathen sacrifices; and I would ask this man, supposing that Christian priests anciently borrowed it from the heathens, whether it was a sin or shame in them, or a disgrace to Christianity, to transfer it from the idol worship of pagans, and consecrate it, as they did their idol temples[g], to the service of the true God. I say, supposing, but not granting, because the phrase is in several places of the gospel, and was, without doubt, taken by the Church from thence. I also beg leave to tell him of a laudable religious rite among the heathens, who accounted the table, at which they entertained their friends, *ἱερον χρῆμα*[h], "a very sacred thing," and as a sort of "altar for the gods of friendship and hospitality;" and for this reason 'it was counted a great crime among them to dishonour them, and the entertainments at them, by any dishonest or indecent behaviour[i], according to that of Juvenal;

Hic verbis nullus pudor, aut reverentia mensæ[k].'

They were also wont to offer 'libations' upon them in gratitude to their gods, and, as we may be sure, never blasphemed them, or ridiculed their oracles, or their lying signs and wonders, or spoke against their priests as knaves, and priesthood as priestcraft, while they feasted at them; or entertained one another, and the whole company, with such

[f] [Barnabæ Brissonii de Formulis et sollemnibus Pop. Rom. verbis, lib. i. p. 79. Francofurti. 1592.]

[g] [See Bingham, Antiquities of the Christian Church, book viii. ch. 2. § 4.]

[h] Dr. Potter's Archæol. Græc., vol. ii. book iv. ch. xx. [*ἱερὸν χρῆμα, δι' ἧς ὁ Θεὸς τιμᾶται φίλιός τε καὶ ξένιος*, Synesius, Ep. lvii., and "Cleodemus in Plutarch calls it, *φιλίων θεῶν βωμὸν καὶ ξενίων.*"]

[i] Ibid.

[k] [D. J. Juvenal. Sat. ii. 110.]

profane discourse, as the author of the Rights and his companions did, at the entertainment of which I have given some account above, and as one of that sort of men more lately did at another table, where, though no priest, he presumed to say, that preaching, praying, and Sacraments were all 'stuff.' I wish all the priestcraft I am master of were sufficient to persuade the atheists and deists among us, so far to return to Christianity, as to imitate the heathens in this religious custom, when they sit down to table at their entertainments, in paying as much honour to the true God, as they did to the false; and to be afraid, as they were, to profane their tables with irreligious communication, especially with discourses of such a direful, and piacular nature, as, if the 'Gallionism' of these times suffers them to speak and write on with impunity, will be avenged by God on the community in heavy judgments, which any serious person may better imagine than I can describe. At least, let the ecclesiastical authority make enquiry after them, and when they have found them, censure them, and burn their books; for they are *βέβηλοι, ἀνίεροι, ἀσεβεῖς, ἀνόσιοι, ἐναγεῖς, ἐξάγιστοι,* 'profane, unholy, impious, ungodly, polluted, execrable' men, in the heathenish sense of the words, and therefore, for heathenish reasons, common with heathens to Jews and Christians, let them be excluded from Christian communion, and not suffered to come into our Churches and to our altars, or into our pulpits to profane them[1]. Let them be corrected at least with the apostolic rod, lest those in whose hands it is put, by longer forbearance, provoke our Lord, whose vicegerents they are in His kingdom, to require the neglect of their duty at their hands, and tempt the people in good earnest to think, as these His enemies would have all the world believe, that their pretended priestly power is indeed nothing but real priestcraft.

CHARGE OF PRIEST-CRAFT.

Let them consider that all the satanical insults of these blasphemers, and all the affronts and reproaches they throw upon their order, terminate in Him who is the High-Priest of their profession; but He is also the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and if He is once roused, if once He is angry at them for their too long forbearance, then blessed are all they who

[1] [See notes, k, p. 54, p, p. 72.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. IV.

do their duty, and put their trust in Him. If once His patience is provoked by them, He will cast the seven stars out of His right hand, and remove the candlesticks out of their places, for the nonuser of their power, and still suffering these men to seduce His servants, and instruct them in the depths of Satan; and as He can come as a thief, so none knows how quickly He may come, to visit them for this great sin of lukewarmness, and letting His sceptre of authority, and the sword and axe of spiritual punishment, rust in their hands. Nay let me say, that, if such men should finally escape their animadversion, it will be more tolerable for the heathen priests, even for the Druids themselves, in the day of judgment, (to whom the Rights doth liken them for priestcraft,) than for them; and [they will?] condemn them for having less courage, and zeal for the honour of the true God, and His religion, than they had for their idol gods.

I have said all this in answer to the foul imputation of priestcraft, which our author hath laid upon the clergy of all ages, for 'making,' as he terms it, the Lord's Supper 'a mystery, and a sacrifice, in the heathenish sense of the words;' and if this be heathenish priestcraft, I confess I am most guilty of it in the following letters, and deserve severe punishment both from God and men. All serious Christians among us believe it to be a mystery, though not to be a sacrifice, a sacrificial mystery, as the passover, to which it answers, and in whose place it did succeed by our Saviour's institution, was.

SECT. V.

Causes of our forgetting the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

It hath been my endeavour, especially in the first of the following letters, to revive this ancient true catholic doctrine, which hath accidentally grown into disuse and almost utter oblivion in this Church, by the alterations that were made in the Office, or Order of administering the Lord's Supper in the first Liturgy of the Church of England, which in the Appendix[m] I have presented to the view of the world.

In the changes made in that office, the word 'altar,' which had been used in all ages of the Church before[n], even in the purest as well as the most corrupt, was left out of the rubrics. And the prayer of oblation, which had been ever

[m] Appendix, No. 1.

[n] [See Christian Priesthood, ch. ii. sect. 8.]

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

used before the delivering of the Sacrament, in which we pray God "mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," was put in the post-communion after the Lord's prayer, of which I read thus in my interleaved Common Prayer-book[o]: "In King Edward's first service-book, this prayer was set before the delivery of the Sacrament to the people, and followed immediately after the consecration; and certainly it was the better and more natural order of the two; neither do I know whether it were the printer's negligence, or no, thus to displace it. For the consecration of the Sacrament being ever the first, it was always the use in all liturgies, to have the oblation follow, (which is this,) and then the participation, which goes before, and after all the thanksgiving, which is here set next before the *gloria in excelsis*. In regard whereof I have always observed my Lord [and master[p] Dr.] Overall," (the reverend bishop of Norwich,) "to use this oblation in its right place, when he had consecrated the Sacrament, to make an offering of it (as being the true public sacrifice of the Church) unto God; that 'by the merits of Christ's death,' which was now commemorated, 'all the Church' of God might receive mercy, &c., as in this prayer; and when that was done, he did communicate the people, and so end with the thanksgiving following hereafter. If men would consider the nature of this Sacrament, how it is the Christian's sacrifice also, they could not choose but use it so too. For as it stands here it is out of its place."

In the alterations made in the office for administering the Lord's Supper in King Edward the Sixth's service-book, that rubric was also left out, which commanded the minister to 'set the bread and wine upon the altar[q],' as an offering. But this rubric was restored in the office for the Church of Scotland[r],

[o] [See p. 107, and note k. Nichols' Add. Notes, p. 50. col. ii.]

[p] [The words "my lord and master" are added above the line in Bishop Cosin's hand, but in a different ink, and written at a different time. Cosin, as has been said, had been Overal's chaplain and librarian.]

[q] [Rubric after the sentences to be read at the offertory, (Book of Common Prayer, 1549,) omitted in 1552. "Then shall the minister take so much bread and wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the holy communion, laying the bread upon the corporas, or else in the paten, or in some other comely thing prepared for that purpose: and putting the wine into the chalice, or else in some fair or convenient cup prepared for that use, (if the chalice will not serve,) putting thereto a little pure and clean water, and setting both the bread and the wine upon the altar."]

[r] ["And the presbyter shall then offer up, and place the bread and wine

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. V.

and likewise in the office of the holy communion of our present liturgy, established by the act of uniformity after the Restoration[s], with an intention undoubtedly to oblige the priest to place the elements, as an offering, with reverence, upon the Lord's table. But as the disuse of this practice had taken deep root, from the fifth year of King Edward VI., when the first service-book was altered, to that time, and helped to obliterate the notion of the Christian sacrifice in the minds both of priests and people; so this restored rubric, to the great reproach of the clergy, was almost never since observed in cathedral or parochial Churches. I say almost never, because I never knew, or heard, but of two or three persons, which is a very small number, who observed it; but the bread and wine was still placed upon the table before the office of the communion began, without any solemnity, it may be by the clerk, or sexton, or any other, perhaps unfitter person, to the great derogation of the reverence due to the holy mystery; and I hope, for the sake of my good intentions, no worthy clergyman will be displeased at me for taking notice thereof.

This practice of the officiating priests setting the bread and wine, in the sight of the people, with reverence, upon the holy table, was so inviolably observed in ancient times, that they had in their churches a buffet[t] or side-table, on the right or left hand of the altar, upon which a priest or deacon set the bread and wine, from whence they were carried by the deacon, or other priest, when there were two, to the officiating priest, who reverently placed them as an offering on the Lord's table. This side-table for the elements and holy

prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's table, that it may be ready for service."—Prayer-Book for the Church of Scotland, 1637.]

[s] ["The priest shall then place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient."—Book of Common Prayer, 1662.]

[t] Ducange's Constantinopolis Christiana, lib. iii. p. 59. [Utramque concham secretarium vocat Paulinus, prioriusque, seu Prothesis, usum sic describit: Hic locus est veneranda penus, qua conditur, et qua Promitur alma sacri pompa ministerii.—Ducange, lib. iii. c. 67. p. 39, col. i. D,E. Et, cum in utraque concha, quæ ad sacram Liturgiam peragendam necessaria sunt, atque adeo in Prothesi hostia et vinum, in Diaconico vestes et libri et vasa ac ministeria Ecclesiastica, parentur, inde binæ istæ conchæ paratoria nuncupantur in Ordine Romano, ibid. col. ii. A.]

See Bufet in my Gram. Franc., p. 93. [Bufet, Gall. abacus in quo pocula et alia ad mensam reponuntur. Compositum est ex Francicis, vel Sax. beoð, mensa; et fat, vel vat, Sax. ƿæt ƿat, vas.—p. 93. Linguarum Vett. Septentrionalium Thesauri Pars Secunda: seu Institutiones Gramm. Franco-Theotiscæ. Oxoniæ, 1703.]

vessels, was called in the Greek Church[u] *πρόθεσις*[x], because they were first set in public view upon it, and in the Latin Church *paratorium*[y], because they were prepared and made ready upon it, for the holy communion; and in Italy it is called 'credenza,' in France 'credence,' for the same reason, from the ancient Gothic, or Teutonic verb 'garedan,' or 'geredan;' in Saxon 'ȝeȝedan,' in Kilian, 'ghe-reeden,' *parare*, THE LORD'S SUPPER.

[u] Chrys. Op., tom. iv. pp. 524, 535. [ed. Morel. Tom. xii. p. 780, A. p. 788, B. ed. Ben. The words are quoted in the next note.]

[x] *Πρόθεσις*, saith Hervetus, propositio, ideo fortasse, quod panis, qui est a sacerdote consecrandus, in eo primo ponitur. In eo autem sacerdos, quæ sunt ad sacrificandum necessaria præparat.—Liturg. S. Chrysost. Op., tom. iv. p. 524. *Εὐχὴ εἰς τὴν πρόθεσιν, ὅπου τίθενται τὰ ἱερὰ πρὸ τοῦ κομισθῆναι εἰς τό βῆμα, ὅστις τόπος ἐστιν ἐν τῇ ἀριστερᾷ τοῦ βήματος.* See also the Reverend Sir George Wheeler's ingenious and accurate description of the churches of the primitive Christians described by Eusebius, &c. p. 99. [An account of the Churches or places of Assembly of the Primitive Christians, as described by Eusebius. Lond. 1689.] See the word in Suicer's Thesaurus, and Habertus's Pontificale, p. 2.

[The passage quoted from St. Chrysostom is found in his Liturgy, as printed in Morell's edition of his works. In the older copies of it (see Goar's Euchologium, pp. 63, 96; and Monitum, ed. Ben., tom. xii. p. 775), the corresponding passage is, *ὁ διάκονος ἐπὶ τῇ προθέσει τῶν τιμίων δώρων· τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν. ὁ ἱερεὺς τὴν εὐχὴν τῆς προθέσεως.*—Op., tom. xii. pp. 779, E. 780, A. ed. Ben. However, afterwards there occurs, *καὶ προσκυνοῦντες τρὶς, ἀπέρχονται ἐν τῇ προθέσει, προπορευομένου τοῦ διακόνου μετὰ θυμιάματος.*—Ibid., p. 788, B.

The passages referred to in Suicer and Habertus are—

Πρόθεσις. In bemate, de quo in voce *βῆμα*, duo erant altaria, quandoque etiam tria. Ubi duo, alterum in medio, et majus, et *ἁγία τράπεζα*: alterum minus, et ad sinistram ejus, et *πρόθεσις* dicitur, id est, propositio, ideo fortasse, inquit Hervetus, quod panis qui est a sacerdote consecrandus, in eo primo ponitur. In eo autem sacerdos, quæ sunt ad sacrificandum necessaria præparat.—Suiceri Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, tom. ii. p. 842. Amstelodami, 1728.

Πρόθεσις altare minus ad lævam majoris, ad quod primum afferuntur munere præparanda, panis et vinum.—Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiæ Græcæ, labore Isaaci Haberti, p. 2, note. Parisiis, 1643.

The following extract is the description by Sir G. Wheeler—

"On each side of this *βῆμα* (or chancel) or tribunal, viz., to the north and south, are two other small apartments, about half the bigness of the *βῆμα*, covered usually at the top with a small cupola, as there is in like manner over the four corners of the temple; which make the whole symmetry of the roof of it most beautiful and uniform. Each of these have two doors, one to enter in from the aisles, and another into the *βῆμα*. That towards the north was called *διακονίκον*, as the reverend Dr. Beveridge shews at large; but it is now called *πρόθεσις* by the present Greeks and in the present rubrics both of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil's Liturgies. There is usually a little table in it, and a niche in the wall, where they lay up the bread that is offered by the people, or brought in for the Sacrament. There also they prepare the Sacrament with some ceremonies before they carry it solemnly in to the altar, and thither they carry it again, to eat and drink up what remains, when the Liturgy is finished. Which table they call *τράπεζα τῆς προθέσεως*, as well as the bread *ἄρτος τῆς προθέσεως*; and thence it is that they carry it solemnly into the *βῆμα* coming first out by the door towards the aisle, and thence enter in by the great door in the middle."]

[y] [This word is explained by Ducange, as, Secretarium Ecclesiæ, seu locus ubi pontifex et qui sacra facturi sunt, sese parant, id est adornant, et vestes ecclesiasticas induunt.—Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis, tom. v. col. 170. ed. Ben. Paris. 1733.]

apparare, ordinare, 'to make ready, to prepare.' Hence the noun 'garedeins,' or 'geredeins[z],' 'garedens,' or 'geredens,' by contraction 'gredence[a],' *paratorium,* from whence 'credenza,' and 'credence[b],' in barbarous Latin *credentia,* by changing *g* into *c,* which is usual, as in the old English word 'click,' from the Saxon 'gelecan,' *apprehendere, rapere,* 'to take,' or 'snatch;' the French word 'crier,' in English 'cry,' from the old Teutonic, 'greidan,' Ital. 'gridare,' Hisp. 'gridar,' 'gritar,' *clamare;* and the English, 'coxcomb,' from the Saxon 'geoc-gum,' compounded of 'gec,' or 'geoc,' in Kilian 'gheok,' *præceps, temerarius, stultus, fatuus, vecors, delirius,* and 'gum,' *homo.*

As more preparation was required in offering the bloody sacrifices of the Jews, so had they many more credences, or tables of preparation, for them, than are needful in Christian temples, for the one unbloody Eucharistical oblation, consisting, as Irenæus observes[c], only of the creatures of bread and wine. There were eight cubits between the north wall of the court of the temple, and the *laniena* or place of slaughter, which was twelve cubits and a half broad, on the side of which were hung up the skins of the victims. Next to it was a place of eight cubits for eight marble tables[d], upon

[z] So in the ancient German or Gothic tongue, 'goleins,' salutatio, is from 'golian,' salutare, and 'galaubeins,' fides, from 'galaubian,' credere.

[a] So the old Saxon and German noun, 'gerefa,' comes, is contracted in old English into 'greve,' in the barbarous Latin into 'grafio,' and in the German, 'grave.' So from the Angl. Sax. ȝepuh, austerus, 'gruff.'

[b] Ducange's Glossar., "Credentia, [Italis, credenza, credentiaria, Gallis, credence,] abacus, [tabula seu] mensa, in qua vasa ad convivia reponuntur, vel etiam mensula, quæ vasa altaris continet ...Ceremoniale Romanum, lib. i. sect. 3. Describitur pluribus in Ceremoniali Episcoporum, lib. i. cap. 12. [The following is part of the description. Restat, ut de mensa, seu abaco, quam credentiam vocant, pauca subjiciamus. Ea vero in missis tantum solennioribus præparari solet, a latere Epistolæ, in plano Presbyterii, . . . atque a pariete parumper disjuncta . . . Ejus mensura regulariter erit palmorum octo in longitudine, in latitudine quatuor, vel circa, in altitudine quinque vel modicum ultra; lineoque mantili mundo superstrato contegetur. Super ea ponentur duo candelabra cum cereis . . . calix cum patena, et palla, purificatorio, et bursa corporalia continente, . . . hostiaria cum hostiis, et pelvicula cum ampullis vini et aquæ; eaque omnia cooperientur velo pulchro. The mitres, staff, and vessels for washing the hands, incense, books, &c., were also to be placed on it.—Ceremoniale Episcoporum, pp. 72, 73. Antwerp, 1713. Ducange, tom. ii. col. 1147.]

[c] [S. Iren. Cont. Hær., lib. 4. c. xviii. § 4. p. 251. See account of third edition, pp. 8, 9.]

[d] R. M. Maimonides de [cultu divino ex] secunda lege, seu manu forti, Paris. 1678. p. 23. [Ab pariete aquilonari ad lanienam intercedebant octo cubiti. Jam laniena ipsa patebat cubitos duodecim et semissem, cujus e latere suspensis victimis pelles detrahebantur. Tum octo cubitos patebat spatium mensarum: in eo mensæ erant marmoreæ, in quibus disponebantur victimarum artus, et lavabatur caro jamjam coquenda: mensæ vero omnino fuerunt octo.—Tractatus primus, de Ædificio Templi, cap. v. § xiii. xiv.]

which were disposed the joints, or parts of the washed bodies of these victims. Besides these again were two tables[e], on the west side of the ascent unto the great altar, one of which was for the utensils necessary for the sacrifice, and the other for the reception of the pieces of the victims to be laid or thrown upon the altar.

I have made these remarks for three reasons; first, to move the clergy of cathedral and parochial churches, to put the aforesaid rubric in practice, which in the Communion enjoins the priest to place the bread and wine upon the Lord's table.

Secondly, to persuade them to restore the ancient use of the *paratorium*, or table of preparation, which that rubric plainly implies; for the priest is supposed either to fetch them from some place, or else to have them brought from some place to him, that he may set them on the altar; and I cannot tell why that should not be another table, in some part of the church or chancel, to set the bread and wine and holy vessels upon, especially where there is no sacristy or vestry, where they may be conveniently set till they are brought unto the priest.

In cathedrals, it seems to be most proper for the deacon or another priest, as the sacrist commonly is, to bring the elements to the bishop or officiating priest; but in parish churches, where there is neither deacon nor second priest, the churchwarden, or other fit person, might reverently bring them from the credence, wheresoever placed, to the rail, where the minister might receive them of him to place them upon the altar. This practice would conciliate a greater measure of reverence than is often seen, to the holy Sacrament, and help the people to conceive how the bread and wine is their oblation, and how it is made a sacrifice by the ministry of the priest.

Thirdly, I have also mentioned the ancient custom, and true meaning of the 'credence,' to justify the memory of our English Cyprian, Archbishop Laud, against the false, shall I say, or ridiculous charge, which was brought against

[e] Ibid., p. 10. [Erant etiam ad occidentem collis mensæ duæ, una e marmore, et ex argento altera. In illa victimarum ordinabantur membra: in hac apta rei divinæ vasa erant disposita. —Ibid., cap. ii. § xv.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. V.

him for 'traitorously endeavouring to alter and subvert God's true religion, by law established in this realm, and instead thereof to set up popish superstition and idolatry[f].'

One main evidence to prove this charge, may be seen in these words[g]: Fourthly, "As this archbishop introduced an altar, so likewise a 'credentia,' or side-table, into his chapel, covered with a large towel or linen cloth, never seen nor heard of there before his time, whereon the bread and wine intended to be consecrated at the Sacrament, were first placed with a great deal of solemnity, before they were brought up to the altar; after which the archbishop's chaplains, being about to consecrate the elements, usually repaired to this 'credentia,' and taking them from thence into their hands, made three low bowings or genuflections to the altar[h], and coming up unto it, offered up the bread and wine thereat upon their knees, and then laid them on the altar; which ceremonies were there used in the archbishop's presence sundry times, when the Sacrament was administered, if not by his special direction, yet certainly with his approbation." The other evidences were taken from pictures[i] in the windows of Lambeth chapel[k], as that of Christ on the cross; His rising from the dead; His ascension; that of the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove descending upon the apostles; the pictures of Christ raising up Lazarus, and administering His last supper to His disciples; placing the communion-table altar-wise, and making a rail about it; setting silver candlesticks with tapers, and a silver bason, and a costly Common Prayer Book on the altar; bowings to the altar; copes; standing up at 'Glory be to the Father;' organs; an English Bible[l] with a rich embroidered crucifix on the cover; popish books, as Missals, Pontificals, and Hours; a book of his own private prayers and devotions, extracted out of popish offices; the pictures of St. Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustin, and Hierom in his gallery; his inserting divers prayers[m] into

[f] Prynne's Canterbury's Doom, pp. 57, 58. London, 1646.

[g] Ibid., p. 63.

[h] So he maliciously expresses the adorations made to God before His altar.

[i] See his answer to all these particulars, ch. xxxii. xxxiii. pp. 310—324. History of the Troubles and Tryal of Archbishop Laud, written by himself. London, 1695.

[k] [Prynne, ibid., pp. 59—65.]

[l] [Ibid., pp. 66, 67.]

[m] [Ibid., p. 70.]

the form of the king's coronation[n] [taken] *verbatim* out of the Roman Pontifical[o]; but above all the "credentia," for "who," saith he[p], "but a professed papist in heart and affection, durst ever introduce such a gross popish innovation into his [own] chapel, [not used in any other place but it,] except in popish churches in foreign parts, or the queen's [own] chapel here, and that by direction of the Roman Ceremonial, Pontifical, Missal?" THE LORD'S SUPPER.

And in the charge that the Scottish commissioners were allowed to bring against him, to prove him guilty of popish innovations in religion, this was one[q]; that [in the Scottish Prayer Book] he "inverted the order of the Communion in the book of England . . . . . in joining the spiritual praise and thanksgiving, which is in the book of England pertinently after the communion, with the prayer of consecration before the communion, and that under the name of 'memorial' or 'oblation[r],' for no other end but that the memorial, or sacrifice of praise, mentioned in it, may be understood according to the popish meaning, (Bellarm. *de Missa,* lib. ii. cap. 21[s],) not of the spiritual sacrifice, but of the oblation of the body of the Lord. . . . The corporal presence of Christ's body in the Sacrament is also to be found here; for the words of the Mass Book serving to this purpose, which are sharply censured by Bucer in King Edward's Liturgy[t], and are not to be found in the book of England,

[n] [In the third edition the words were, "into the form of the king's coronation oath verbatim, &c." The passage has been corrected from Prynne.]

[o] This charge was utterly false. [Feb. 2, 1625-6. Die Jovis et Purificationis B. V. Mariæ, coronatus est Rex Serenissimus Carolus: ego functus sum vice Decani Westmon.—Diary prefixed to History, &c. p. 28. "They say one of the prayers was taken out of the Pontifical. And I say, if it were, it was not taken thence by me. And the prayers are the same that were used at King James's coronation."—History, &c. p. 318.]

[p] [Prynne, ibid., p. 65.] See the Archbishop's answer to this charge in the History of his Troubles and Trial, p. 318.

[q] The Charge of the Scottish Commissioners, printed at London, in 4to. 1641. pp. 11—13; and in Canterbury's Doom, pp. 34, 35. See the Archbishop's vindication, in the History of his Troubles and Trial, pp. 115, 121.

[r] ["Immediately after (the Prayer of Consecration) shall be said this memorial or Prayer of Oblation as followeth." Book of Common Prayer for the use of the Church of Scotland, 1637.]

[s] [Significatur enim ea voce sacrificium veri corporis Domini, quod sacrificium laudis dicitur, quia per illud Deus magnopere laudatur, et gratiæ illi aguntur, pro summis ejus in nos beneficiis.—Bellarmini Disputationes, tom. iii. p. 1133, C. Ingoldstadii. 1601.]

[t] [The words in King Edward's first book were, "Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech Thee; and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be

are taken in here; Almighty God is incalled, that 'of His almighty goodness He may vouchsafe [so] to bless and sanctify, by His Word and Spirit, these gifts of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Christ.'"

Thus was this great and most worthy prelate, who defended himself with equal courage and reason, not only most falsely, but in a most ridiculous manner, charged with endeavouring to subvert our religion, and instead thereof to set up popery in the realm, by his enemies of both kingdoms, at the bar of both houses, of which the great and noble historian writes thus[u]; "they charged him with several articles of high treason, which, if all that was alleged against him had been true, could not have made him guilty of treason. They accused him of a design to bring in popery, and of having correspondence with the pope, and such like particulars as the consciences of his greatest enemies absolved him from. No man was a greater, or abler enemy to popery; no man a more resolute and devout son of the Church of England. He was prosecuted by lawyers[x] assigned to that purpose, out of those, who from their own antipathy to the Church and bishops, or from some disobligations received from him, were sure to bring passion, animosity, and malice enough of their own; what evidence soever they had from others. And they treated him with all the rudeness, reproach, and barbarity imaginable; with which his judges were not displeased."

One would think, after such an account of his trial, from so great an historian, who did not conceal his human frailties, none should have the confidence to impeach him over

unto us the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ, Who," &c. On which Bucer remarked, Optarim verba illa his mutari verbis aut similibus, 'Audi nos, o misericors Deus Pater, atque benedic nobis, et sanctifica nos verbo ac Spiritu Sancto tuo, ut corpus et sanguinem filii tui ex ipsius manu his mysteriis vera fide percipiamus in cibum potumque vitæ æternæ.' Quæ me eo adducunt, ut talem loci hujus optem fieri mutationem, hæc sunt. Precatio ista pro tali panis et vini benedictione in mensa Domini, atque sanctificatione, ut corpus nobis Domini sit et sanguis, non est mandata a Domino; et ad confirmandas retinendasque horrendas impietates detorquentur. And on these reasons he enlarges.—See Censura in Ordinationibus Ecclesiasticis in Anglia.—Martini Buceri Scripta Anglicana, p. 468. Basil. 1577.]

[u] History of the Rebellion, vol. ii. book viii. p. 440. [fol. 1703. vol. v. pp. 31, 32. 8vo. 1826.]

[x] Their names may be seen in Prynne's Canterbury's Doom, [p. 24. Pym, Hampden, and Maynard.]

again, and murder his good name and memory as barbarously, as his unrighteous accusers and judges did his person. But the author of the Rights, abandoned to truth and modesty, lays many of the same false charges upon him again[y], for which he cites his most malicious enemies, Prynne, Whitlock, and Rushworth, though his innocence had been long clearly vindicated before men and angels, beyond all contradiction, to the dishonour of his old, and the confusion of his new enemies, and particularly to the everlasting shame of the Rights, in a book which the author could not be ignorant of, viz., The History of the Archbishop's Troubles, and Trial, published by Mr. Wharton at London, 1695.

First, he charges him out of Whitlock's Memoirs, for patronizing Chowney's book[z], which "averred the Church of Rome to be a true Church," and him, and "all other bishops, who were present at the censure of Bastwick in the Star-Chamber for denying openly that they had their jurisdiction, as bishops, from the king," which they asserted "they had from God alone;" and this he interprets as their "denial of the supremacy of the king under God." The first of these two charges is answered most fully by the archbishop in the History of his Troubles[a]. And how malicious, and full of wilful misconstruction the second is, is manifest from these words, which the archbishop spoke in the Star-Chamber: saith he[b], "Our being bishops *jure divino*,

[y] Rights, Preface, pp. xlvii—liii.

[z] [Whitlock's Memorials of the English Affairs during the reign of King Charles the First, p. 22. fol. 1732. The title of the book referred to, is, Collectiones Theologicæ e diversis auctorum sententiis, opere et industria Thomæ Chounei de Alfhistonio in comitatu Sussexiæ Armigeri, 24mo. 1635. The 'approbatio' is dated Augusti 26, 1634, and signed Gulielmus Haywood. The passage referred to is in Coll. xvi. Quænam sit Romana Ecclesia?—Nec in pessimis usque eo degenerasse censemus ut in primariis et fundamentalibus religionis capitibus aberâsse videatur; quidni, quamvis in cæteris forsan vitiatam et temeratam, ecclesiæ tamen nomine honestandam censemus, pp. 45, 46. It need scarcely be said that 'papist,' as Whitlock calls Chowney, is only a term of reproach.]

[a] chap. xli. pp. 391, 392.

[b] The Second Volume of the Remains of [the most reverend Father in God and blessed martyr] William Laud, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, [written by himself. Collected by the late learned Mr. Henry Wharton, and] printed at London, 1700, p. 68. [The archbishop's words are, "The fourth charge is out of Chowneus' book, pp. 45 and 46, licensed by my chaplain Dr. Braye (see note z), where (they say) it is said, that Rome is a true Church, and differs not in fundamentals; and that at the high commission, when this book was questioned by some, I did say that the Church of Rome and the Protestants did not differ in fundamentals, but in circumstances... First suppose this be false, and that

by divine right, takes nothing from the king's right or power over us. For though our office be from God and Christ immediately, yet may we not exercise that power, either of order or jurisdiction, but as God hath appointed us; that is, not in his majesty's, or any Christian king's, kingdoms, but by and under the power of the king given us so to do."

Then he revives the false[c] charge of his holding that the pope was not antichrist, and of expunging[d] that title given to him out of printed books, which the archbishop answered in the nineteenth day of his trial, in chap. xli. p. 390. Then he charges him with affecting to be called 'his Holiness,' and 'holy Father,' because the University of Oxford styled him so in many of their letters; to which there is a full answer in the History of his Troubles, p. 284 and p. 325, where, because the author of the Rights is a civilian, I shall transcribe the holy father's words; "That in the civil law it is frequent to be seen, that not bishops only one to another, but the great emperors of the world, have commonly given that title of *Sanctitas vestra,* to bishops of meaner place than myself." These things he maliciously produces against him, to shew that his design was to set up an 'independent power

they do differ in fundamentals; yet this is but my error in divinity, no practice to overthrow religion. Secondly, I suppose if I did say so, I did not err, for the foundations of Christian religion are the articles of the creed, and the Church of Rome denies no one of them. Therefore there is no difference in fundamentals."]

[c] [The archbishop does not deny either of these allegations, (of which the second only is explicitly mentioned by Tindal.) His defence was, "There is nothing against me, till it be proved (which is not yet done,) that I have positively denied the pope to be antichrist. And, secondly, I do not conceive that the article of the Church of England, which confirms the homilies, doth also confirm every phrase that is in them. Nor thirdly, do I conceive that the homilies in those places which are cited, do make the pope the great antichrist." ... "The sixth particular was the articles of Ireland, which call the pope the man of sin. (Art. lxxx. of the 104 articles framed by Usher, and passed in a convocation at Dublin, 1615.—Wilkins' Conc., vol. iv. p. 447. See notes to Bramhall's works, vol. v. pp. 80, sqq. 1845.) But the articles of Ireland bind neither this Church nor me. And some learned Protestants do not understand that noted place of the Apostle, 2 Thess. ii., as meant of antichrist or the pope."—History of Troubles, p. 390. Or, as Prynne reports his answer, "I answer that no man can charge me that I hold the pope not to be antichrist: it is a great question, even among learned Protestants, whether he be so or not. The Church of England hath not positively resolved him to be so: the homilies define him not to be antichrist, and the articles of Ireland bind not us here."—Canterbury's Doom, p. 551. Of the second part of the charge, which was unquestionably true, Laud takes no notice in the History of his Troubles. Prynne represents him to have said, "My expunging of this title and others of that nature was upon other grounds."—Ibid., p. 552; which Tindal calls a "jesuitical" answer.]

[d] [See instances in Prynne's Canterbury's Doom, pp. 261, 262.]

in defiance of the oath of supremacy,' and that for that reason he was against the pope's supremacy, because he had a mind to set up an English supremacy.

Lastly, he falsely charges him with causing the picture of the Trinity, where God the Father was drawn like a little old man, to be painted afresh in his chapel at Lambeth, with other pictures to advance priestcraft. For this he cites his great enemy Prynne in his Canterbury's Doom, p. 463. But the charge was false, as, if he did not know it before, he may see in the History of his Troubles, chap. xxxiii. p. 317, where he will find it proved, that there was no picture of God the Father in the chapel at Lambeth. He furthermore saith, he was "the darling of the papists[e], excepting in the point of that independent power he set up for himself;" and what will not a man say, that can say this without blushing; contrary to the history of the times, the blessed martyr's immortal works, his last speech[f], and last will and testament[g], and the testimonies of Mr. Whiston[h] and Mr. Evelyn[i] in the History of his Troubles, p. 616? But of all the reproach he hath had the impudence to blacken his memory with, none

[e] [Rights, Preface, p. li.]

[f] ["I was born and baptized in the bosom of the Church of England established by law; in that profession I have ever since lived, and in that I come to die. This is no time to dissemble with God, least of all in matters of religion; and therefore I desire it may be remembered, I have always lived in the Protestant religion established in England, and in that I come now to die."—Hist. of Troubles, p. 449.]

[g] ["For my faith, I die as I have lived, in the true orthodox profession of the Catholic faith of Christ, foreshewed by the prophets, and preached to the world by Christ Himself, His blessed apostles, and their successors; and a true member of His Catholic Church, within the communion of a living part thereof, the present Church of England as it stands established by law."—Extract from Will.—Ibid., p. 454.]

[h] [Rev. Jonathan Whiston, vicar of Bethersden, in Kent. His words are, "I do remember, that being chaplain to the honourable Sir Lionel Tolmach, baronet, about the year 1666, I heard him relate to some person of quality, how that in his younger days he was at Rome, and well acquainted with a certain abbot, which abbot asked him whether he had heard any news from England? He answerd 'no.' The abbot replied, 'I will tell you then some; Archbishop Laud is beheaded.' Sir Lionel answered, 'You are sorry for that, I presume.' The abbot replied again, 'That they had more cause to rejoice, that the greatest enemy of the Church of Rome in England was cut off, and the greatest champion of the Church of England silenced.' Or in words to that purpose. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, this 28th day of September, 1694.

"JONA. WHISTON,
"Vicar of Bethersden in Kent."]

[i] ["I was at Rome in the company of divers of the English fathers, when the news of the archbishop's suffering, and a copy of his sermon made upon the scaffold, came thither. They read the sermon, and commented upon it with no small satisfaction and contempt; and looked upon him as one that was a great enemy to them, and stood in their way; whilst one of the blackest crimes imputed to him was his being popishly affected.

"JOHN EVELYN."]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. V.

is more false and malicious, than that which he couches in these words[j]: "Not that he was, to do him justice, for advancing the power of the pope, or cared for the Romish religion more than for any other." The name of the devil signifies calumniator, and the Scriptures call him the father of lies, and the accuser of the brethren, and I leave it to the conscience of this calumniator, if he have any left, to consider, whether this slandering reflection, and the many other lies and false accusations he hath recited, of this great man and most excellent prelate, can proceed from any thing but diabolical inspiration, or, which is not much better, a devilish spirit of calumny, which informs and poisons his wicked mind. If any man think this chastisement of him too severe, let him consider what censure he deserves, who could bring himself to revive so many calumnies upon the memory of that just man, after the true history of his trial was published, which he left behind for his vindication to the whole Christian world, against all the enemies the devil had raised up against him. The noble historian, who, as I must observe again, was not sparing or partial in noting his infirmities, tells us[k], that 'his memory deserves a particular celebration,' that 'his learning, piety, and virtue have been attained by very few;' and that 'the greatest of his infirmities are common to all, even to the best of men.' But it is through his sides that the writer of the Rights wounds all whom he calls 'high Church;' he blackens his memory to reproach them, whom he treats in derision, and calls by names of the utmost scandal and contempt. He loads them with many invidious, false charges, particularly[l] in labouring to have the word Church signify the clergy only, in exclusion of the people, as they do in popish countries.

SECT. VI. Of the Church as a society, and Church officers.

Whereas the Church being a society, the name of it is variously used, as in other societies, sometimes in the most proper sense for the clergy and people, as in that of St. Cyprian[m], "a Church is the people united to their bishop, and the flock adhering to their pastor." But then again, by a

[j] [Rights, Preface, pp. xlviii, xlix.]

[k] History of the Rebellion, [vol. ii.] book viii. p. 442. [1703. Vol. v. p. 35. 1826.]

[l] Rights, Preface, pp. lxxxvii. lxxxviii.

[m] Illi sunt Ecclesia plebs sacerdoti adunata, et pastori suo Grex adhærens. —[Ep. lxix. (lxvi. ed. Oxon.) p. 123. ed. Ben.]

CHURCH AND CLERGY.

metonymy common to the names of other societies, it is used sometimes less properly, first for the people only, or the flock without the clergy, as in Acts xx. 28: "Take heed unto yourselves, and unto all the flock, whereof the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops[1] to feed the Church of God." And secondly, for the governors of the Church, as in a council or consistory, as in Matt. xviii. 17: "Tell it unto the Church, but if he neglect to hear the Church;" and in this sense hath it been used in all ages of Christianity, long before popery was in the world, to signify the clergy, or ruling part of the Church. Thus, I conceive, it is more especially to be understood in St. John's salutation, "unto the seven Churches which are in Asia," that is, to the angels of the seven Churches in Asia. So it is used in the sixth canon of the first general council[n]: "Let the ancient customs be observed, that the bishop of Alexandria have the authority of all those that are in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, because the same usage is observed by the bishop of Rome. In like manner are the privileges preserved to the Churches (that is, to the bishops of the Churches) of Antioch, and other provinces." The word is so used in the twentieth of the XXXIX Articles, first in the title, Of the Authority of the Church; and then in the article itself, "the Church hath power to decree rights and ceremonies, and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain," &c. So Article XXXIV.: "Every particular, or national Church, hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies," &c. In this sense we also say the articles, canons, and homilies of the Church of England, that is, the articles, canons, &c. made by the clergy of the Church. In this sense also it is often used in our laws, as in the first article of Magna Charta, where the king grants[o] "for himself, and his heirs for ever," "that the Church of England shall be free, and have all her whole rights and liberties inviolable."

[1] [ἐπισκόπους.]

[Rev. 1. 4; cf. ch. 2 1, 8, &c.]

[n] [τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν. ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο σύνηθές ἐστιν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις, τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.—Concilia, tom. ii. p. 36, C, D.]

[o] [Sciatis nos . . . imprimis concessisse Deo et hac præsenti carta confirmasse, pro nobis et hæredibus nostris in perpetuum, quod Anglicana ecclesia libera sit, et habeat jura sua integra, et libertates suas illæsas.—Statutes of the Realm, vol. i. p. 9. 1810.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VI.

By the same usual figure of speech, house or family signifies the master and father of the family; city, the mayor and aldermen of the city; college, the master of the college; and under the name of army, we often mean only the general, or general and commanders, as when we speak of the orders of the army; and therefore there is no more popery or priestcraft in the clergy, when they speak of themselves under the name of the Church, than mastercraft in the father of a family, when he speaks of himself under the name of the family; or kingcraft in a king, when he speaks of himself under the name of the kingdom; or generalcraft, when the general speaks of himself under the name of the army; but when clergymen do so, he spitefully, as well as scurrilously, saith[p] it is not only "errant priestcraft," but "as ridiculous as if the drummers and trumpeters should call themselves the army, exclusively of all others, and by means of that, endeavour to get the whole power [of it] into their hands, and represent every one as an enemy to the army who will not come into the cheat."

His spite to the clergy makes him plentiful in opprobrious names. In another place he compares them to "trap-setters[q];" in another he saith[r], "it is their interest to have religion corrupted;" and somewhere he saith[s], that "the Christian, which is the best religion, hath the worst priests." And because the Church, according to the wisdom and practice of other societies, hath been always wont, without respect to families or persons, to take fit men, though of lower extraction and fortunes, into her service, he therefore reproaches the whole body of the clergy, for the sake of those among them who are of meaner families, in such a manner as equally reflects upon all sorts of societies and orders of men, at court, in the city, the camp, the senate, at the bar, and on the bench. [This reflection touches the honour of Almighty God, who chose Saul for king out of the smallest of the tribes of Israel, and out of the least of all the families of that tribe, 1 Sam. ix. 21. He also made David, his successor, a king, of a shepherd; and I do not doubt but the author of the Rights thinks a king a more honourable person than a

[p] Rights, Preface, p. lxxxviii.
[q] Ibid., Introduction, p. 24.
[r] Ibid., p. 190.
[s] [Ibid., p. 118.]

CHURCH AND CLERGY.

priest. It][t] also casts pharisaical contempt upon Christ and his Apostles; and, were not his hatred to the clergy above his reason, he could not act so contrary to his character as a Christian, a son of a priest[u], and a civilian, who should know, it was provided by the laws of the empire, that if a slave were made a bishop or priest, he should be *ipso facto* free[v]. Had we slavery or villenage in use among us, I presume it would be no dishonour to the Church, or her hierarchy, if a Zamolxis[w], a Tiro, a Terence, an Epictetus, or an Æsop, were for their excellent gifts taken into the number of the clergy, and, of the servants of men, made, or if he will give me leave so to speak, consecrated into ministers of God. Priests made of slaves in ancient times were thought no dishonour to the priesthood, as is plain from the eighty-second of the Apostolic Canons[x], which tells us that a slave was not to be made a clergyman without the consent of his lord. Such were Epaphras, or Epaphroditus, St. Paul's fellow-labourer, and fellow-soldier, and Onesimus[y] his son, his brother, and his bowels. He cannot take it amiss if I send him once more to a sovereign pontiff, as well as a sovereign prince, I mean to Julian, to be better instructed. For he, though as much concerned for the honour of the priesthood as any man ever was, writes at another rate in the fragment of one of his epistles[z]: "I will," saith he, "that in all cities

Phil. 2. 25.

Col. 4. 9; Philem. 9, 10.

[t] [This passage is inserted from the Supplement of 1715, No. 3. p. 7.]

[u] [See note a, p. 48.]

[v] [Justin. Codex, lib. i. tit. iii. § 37. Si servus sciente domino et non contradicente, in clericum ordinatus fuerit ab episcopo: ex hoc ipso, quod constitutus est, liber et ingenuus erit.—Corp. Jur. Civ., p. 16. Amst. 1663.]

[w] Cyril's answer to Julian, lib. vi. [*καίτοι Ζάμολξις ὁ Θρᾷξ, Πυθαγόρου μὲν ἦν οἰκέτης.*—S. Cyril. Alex., Op., tom. vii. p. 208, E.]

[x] [*(οὐ χρὴ) οἰκέτας εἰς κλῆρον προχειρίζεσθαι ἄνευ τῆς τῶν δεσποτῶν γνώμης, ἀνατροπὴν τὸ τοιοῦτο κατεργάζεται· εἰ δέ ποτε καὶ ἄξιος φανείη ὁ οἰκέτης πρὸς χειροτονίαν βαθμοῦ, οἷος καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος Ὀνήσιμος ἐφάνη, καὶ συγχωρήσουσιν οἱ δεσπόται καὶ ἐλευθερώσουσι, καὶ τοῦ οἴκου ἑαυτῶν ἐξαποστελοῦσι, γινέσθω.*—Canon. Apost. lxxxi (al. lxxii.) Conc., tom. i. p. 42, D.]

[y] Balsam. and Zonar. on LXXXII. Can. Apost. [*Ὀνήσιμον δοῦλον ὄντα Φιλήμονος, ὁ μέγας Παῦλος ἀντέστρεψε πρὸς τὸν Φιλήμονα, κἂν χρησιμώτατος πρὸς διακονίαν ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ, εἰπὼν μὴ δίκαιον εἶναι ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ Φιλήμονος τοῦτον διακονεῖν ἐν τῷ τῆς πίστεως κηρύγματι.*—Balsamon. in loc., Beveregii *Συνόδικον*, tom. i. p. 54, B.

ὁ μέγας γὰρ Παῦλος Ονήσιμον δοῦλον ὄντα Φιλήμονος, καὶ εὔχρηστον αὐτῷ κριθέντα εἰς διακονίαν, ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ δεσπότου κατέχειν οὐκ ἔκρινεν, ἀλλ' ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν πρὸς Φιλήμονα.—Zonaras, ibid., D.]

[z] [*ἐγώ φημι τοὺς ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι βελτίστους, καὶ μάλιστα μὲν τοὺς φιλοθεωτάτους, ἔπειτα φιλανθρωποτάτους, ἐάν τε πένητες ὦσιν, ἐάν τε πλούσιοι· διάκρισις ἔστω πρὸς τοῦτο μηδέ τις οὖν ἀφανοῦς καὶ ἐπιφανοῦς· ὁ γὰρ διὰ πραότητα λεληθὼς οὐ διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀξιώματος ἀφάνειαν δίκαιός ἐστι κωλύεσθαι· κἂν πένης οὖν ᾖ τις, κἂν δημότης, ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ δυὸ ταῦτα, τό τε φιλόθεον, καὶ*

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT VI.

the best men be chosen priests, especially those who are most eminent for their piety to the gods, and their charity towards men, be they poor, or be they rich; for there ought to be no difference in this affair between those of noble, and those of obscure originals, nor ought any humble man to be rejected for his obscurity. Wherefore let any man be chosen a priest who is qualified with these two fundamental virtues, the love of the gods and the love of men."

One reason which St. Chrysostom[a] gives for declining the episcopal order was this: "Lest he being of a rich and splendid family, the people should suspect the bishops ordained him upon that account. Whereas," saith he, "Christ called fishers, and tent-makers, and publicans *ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν ἀρχὴν*, to this principality." So in the tract *de Cœna Domini*[b]: *Sic tu, Domine, armentarios statim facis prophetas*, &c. "So Thou, O Lord, in a moment makest herdsmen prophets, shepherds kings, publicans Apostles, and fishermen doctors of Thy Church." And any one, who is pleased to read how Gregorius Thaumaturgus[c] behaved himself in the choice of a bishop of Comana, will find how little he regarded extraction, though he was himself noble. For after long enquiry for one that was most worthy, he chose one Alexander, for his great virtues, who in appearance was but a collier, though upon farther examination of him, after he had preferred him to all others, he found he was a man of a good family, who disguised himself, and his most beautiful form, under that sordid and smutty occupation, that he might with more convenience devote himself to Christian philosophy, and avoid the dangerous temptations to which his form and stature

τὸ φιλάνθρωπον; ἱέρευς ἀποδεικνύσθω.—Fragm. Epist. Juliani, Op., pp. 304, E. 305, A.]

[a] [*οἷον ὅτι πρὸς πλοῦτον βλέπουσιν, ὅτι λαμπρότητα γένους θαυμάζουσιν ὅτι κολακευθέντες ὑφ' ἡμῶν εἰς τοῦτο ἡμᾶς παρήγαγον· εἰ δὲ καὶ ὅτι χρήμασι πεισθέντες, οὐκ ἔχω λέγειν εἴ τις καὶ τοῦτο ὑποπτεύων ἦν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ Χριστὸς ἁλιεῖς καὶ σκηνοποιοὺς καὶ τελώνας ἐπὶ ταύτην ἔκαλεσε τὴν ἀρχήν.*—S. Chrysost. de Sac., lib. ii. § 8. tom. i. p. 379, C.]

[b] [Sic tu, Domine, armentarios statim facis prophetas, opiliones reges, teloniarios apostolos, piscatores doctores.—De cœna Domini, inter tractatus de cardinalibus Christi operibus; Arnoldi Carnotensis Opera, p. 43, ad calcem S. Cypriani Op., Oxon. 1682. These tracts went under the name of S. Cyprian, and are found in the earlier editions of his Works. Fell appended them to his edition; they are not contained in that of the Benedictines. Arnold was a cotemporary and friend of St. Bernard, cl. A.D. 1162. See Cave, Hist. Lit., tom. ii. p. 236.]

[c] Vita Greg. Thaumaturgi per Greg. Nyssen. Op., tom. ii. pp. 993, 994, &c. [Op., tom. iii. pp. 563—565. Paris. 1638.]

would otherwise have exposed himself and others. [I suppose that had the great Socrates been a Christian, and lived in the time of this Gregory, who was of noble extraction, he would not have rejected him from the priesthood, because he was no better than a stone-cutter or statuary's son[d].]

As for synods, or councils, he saith[e], "There never was one since the times of the apostolic purity, that hath not determined something or other in prejudice of the true religion;" by which undoubtedly he means his own. He condemns them for a reason, for which all senates, and assemblies of men must likewise be condemned, viz., because[f] "the greatest part of mankind are apt to prefer their private interest before any motive whatsoever, especially when they act in bodies: for then reputation and honour, shame and disgrace, which frequently influence single persons, quite lose their force." He saith[g], "they have, generally speaking, been composed of the most ambitious, crafty, and designing men, better versed in the arts of fawning, and flattering, than in the knowledge of religion." What an English synod saith[h] of general councils made up of uncharitable, ambitious, and malicious men (alluding to some such particular unhappy

[d] [This passage is inserted from the Supplement of 1715, No. 4. p. 8. In the MS. additions in Hickes' copy it continues, "Or the great orator Demosthenes, because he was but a cutler's son; or Euripides the poet, because his mother sold herbs in the streets of Athens, which Valerius Maximus observing, (lib. iii. c. 4.) saith, Sed quid aut illius tragica, aut hujus oratoria vi clarius."]

[e] Rights, pp. 191, 192.

[f] Ibid., pp. 193, 194.

[g] Ibid.

[h] [The convocation of 1536. "As concerning general synods, like as we (taught by long experience) do perfectly know that there never was, ne is, anything devised, invented, or instituted by our forefathers, more expedient or more necessary for the establishment of our faith, for the extirpation of heresies, and the abolishing of sects and schisms, and finally for the reducing of Christ's people unto one perfect unity and concord in His religion, than by the having of general councils, so that the same be lawfully had and congregated in *Spiritu Sancto*, and be also conform and agreeable, as well concerning the surety and indifferency of the places, as all other points requisite and necessary for the same, unto that wholesome and godly institution, and usage, for the which they were at first devised and used in the primitive Church. Even so on the other side, taught by like experience, we esteem, repute, and judge that there is, ne can be anything in the world more pestilent and pernicious to the commonweal of Christendom, or whereby the truth of God's word hath in times past or hereafter may be, sooner defaced and subverted, or whereof hath or may ensue more contention, more discords, and other devilish effects, than when such general councils have or shall be assembled, nor christianly nor charitably, but for private malice and ambition, or other worldly and carnal respects and considerations, according to the saying of Gregorius Nazianzenus," &c.—Herbert's Hist. Hen. VIII., p. 470. Given also in Collier's Ch. History, vol. ii. fol. p. 128. (p. ii. book ii.); and Wilkins' Concilia, vol. iii. p. 808. Tindal quotes only the latter part.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VII.

synods), he makes the character of all, and falsely saith it was the opinion of Gregory Nazianzen[i]; whereas what that holy father wrote was only written of the council of Constantinople, in sickness, chagrin[j], and discontent, where he had not been well treated, and never was designed by him for a general character or rule. He saith[k], that "he was at several councils, particularly that he was at that general and creed-making one of Constantinople." Where the reader may observe where his core at councils lies; it was a creed-making council; it made that creed which is in the ancient liturgies, and which our ancestors used a thousand years ago, and we still use in the communion service, and Gregory was one of the chief creed-makers in it[l]; and if his testimony is good against the heats and passionate debates which happened in the council about himself, it is as good for the creed. Nay, if he is a testable person, his testimony must be taken in behalf of the first general council of Nice; for he was a great impugner of the Arians[m], of whom our author and the theistical club are great admirers, and a zealous defender of the Nicene faith. He professes so much in his forty-ninth oration, translated by Ruffinus[n], but more especially in his twenty-first oration[o], in praise of that creed-making

[i] Rights, p. 195.

[The Convocation and the Rights refer to the passage in S. Greg. Naz. Epist. cxxx. (al. lv.) ad Procopium; *ἔχω μὲν οὕτως, εἰ δεῖ τἀληθὲς γράφειν, ὥστε πάντα σύλλογον φεύγειν ἐπισκόπων, ὅτι μηδεμιᾶς συνόδου τέλος εἶδον χρηστὸν, μήδε λύσιν κακῶν μᾶλλον ἐσχηκυίαν ἢ προσθήκην· ἀεὶ γὰρ φιλονεικίαι καὶ φιλαρχίαι . . . καὶ λόγου κρείττονες.*—Opera, tom. ii. p. 110, C.]

[j] La 55. Dans laquelle il declare, qu'il craint toutes les assemblees ecclesiastiques, parceque il n'a jamais vû, dit il, la fin d'aucun concile, qui ait été heureuse, et agreable, et qui n'ait augmenté le mal, plutot que le deminuer, Mais cette maxime qu'il a écrite etant chagrin contre le Concile de Constantinople, qui ne l'avoit traité assez favorablement, ne doit passer pour une regle, mais seulement pour un espéce de ressentiment, qui est échapé à Saint Gregoire.—Dupin. Nouvelle Biblioth., tom. ii. 4to. pp. 652, 653. 1687.

[k] [Rights, ibid.]

[l] [St. Gregory presided in the council of Constantinople after the death of St. Meletius of Antioch.—Theodoret. Hist. Eccl., lib. v. cap. 8. tom. iii. p. 201.]

[m] ["Orat. xxv. ad Arianos," (Orat. xxxiii. pp. 603, sqq. ed. Ben.) Additional note in Supplement, 1715, No. 5. p. 8.]

[n] Op., vol. i. p. 727. [Paris. 1630. Quod docendum et quod credendum cunctis Ecclesiis fuerat traditum, quodque patres nostri, apostolici viri, contra universas hæreses et maxime Arianam, quasi quendam obicem veritatis . . . Sancto Spiritu mundati catholica ratione posuerunt.—De Fide Orthodoxa contra Arianos, § 4. S. Greg. Naz. Op., tom. i. App., p. 890. ed. Ben. This oration, which is headed, Ruffino Presbytero interprete, in the edition of 1630, was not written by St. Gregory, nor is it found among those translated by Ruffinus. It is generally agreed that it was originally written in Latin, and the Benedictine editors, after Tillemont, assign it to Phœbadius bishop of Aginna, A.D. 359.]

[o] [*ἐν ἁγίᾳ ταύτῃ συνόδῳ, καὶ τῷ τῶν τριακασίων ὀκτὼ καὶ δέκα ἀριθμῷ ἀνδρῶν*

OF COUNCILS.

rascal Athanasius; where he calls the synod "the holy synod," and the fathers "the holy fathers;" and therefore if he is a good witness, there was one synod at least, and that a general one, which determined nothing in prejudice of the true religion. Nay, if his testimony is to be taken, the sacerdotal and regal power are distinct from, and independent of one another, as he may see in the second tome, Of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order and Office, in a letter to a serjeant-at-law[p].

In the rest of the chapter[q] he hath raked together out of several writers a very invidious account of the ill conduct of councils, and of the divisions and quarrels of bishops in them, with his own reflections and applications; which will signify nothing to wise and serious men, who in this case can consider the difference between the men and the priests; as in others of the like nature between the men and the senators, or between the man and the king. All he hath maliciously scraped and patched together on this melancholy subject, amounts to no more than this, that priests and bishops are men, and not angels, men of like passions and infirmities with others, and that every one of them may say, as Siracides makes Solomon speak of himself[r]: "I myself also am a mortal man, like to all, and the offspring of him, that was first made of earth." Priests therefore, like kings, and princes, and senators, and judges, are at best but frail men; and our author's way of arguing against them in their single, or synodical capacity, from their miscarriages, is in effect to impeach the wisdom of God in making mortal men priests, and to argue not Christianity, not the Church only, but civil government and rulers, out of the world. Julian the apostate, who knew the divisions, and parties, and quarrels that were and had been, among Christian priests, both in and out of synods, better than our author, was a better reasoner than to make use of this argument against them. He knew very well, that this way of representing any sort, or rank, or order of mortals, had no sense, though much of popular fallacy in it, and in reality

λογάδων, οὓς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἰς ἓν ἤγαγεν.—Orat. xxi. § 14. tom. i. p. 394, A. The last clause is not found in the Greek of the editions before the Benedictine.]

[p] [Second Discourse, chap. i. sect. 3.]

[q] [Rights, chap. vi.]

[r] [Wisdom vii. 1. The words are not in Ecclesiasticus, as the mention of Siracides, which seems to be a mistake of memory, would imply.]

was nothing but a satire on the nature of man; and the differences among the clergy in or out of councils, never had that effect upon the Christians of ancient times, as to make them despise their order, or disobey their authority, much less to suspect that Christian priesthood was but priestcraft. There were then no such monsters among Christians, no such infernal enemies to priesthood, as our author and his gang. For they did not only consider, that priests were men subject to divers temptations, and capable, like other Christians, of committing sins of all sorts, but believed also, that as the devils, those enemies of Christ, were more diligent to tempt Christians than other men; so they were busier with priests than other Christians; but never thought the priesthood, or the authority belonging to it, ought to be affected with the miscarriages, or fall of their priests. At his way of speaking, what a fine harangue might a learned Jew or Mahometan make against Christianity, from the former and later divisions of Christians, out of Christian writers, with particular reflections upon these times, in which, to the great dishonour of the Christian religion, but without being a real argument against the truth of it, Christian nations and kingdoms have for twenty years been sheathing their swords in one another's bowels, to say no worse, in most unchristian wars, without a sword being drawn in any part of the unbelieving world.

His words also in the mouth, or from the pen, of a Sadducee, or of a theistical Jew, if there had been any such, would have made a fine flourish of no force against the Jewish clergy, to persuade his readers, if he could, that the Mosaic priesthood and institutions were all priestcraft; and that Moses (as a theist lately said) was a cunning fellow, who made himself a king, and his brother a priest. The golden calf; the sons of Eli, those sons of Belial, who made themselves so vile; the priests taking strange wives in their captivity; their polluting the table of the Lord after it; all the complaints in the prophets against them, particularly in their synodical capacity, as members of the Sanhedrim, would have been matter of a much more plausible harangue against the priesthood then, than all our author hath collected now; yet for all this, and much more, that might be added, the Jewish princes, and people, still venerated their priests for

the sake of their office, and that for the sake of its Divine institution; and had any of them been so wicked as this author, to write after his reproachful manner against the priests, the whole congregation would have stoned him to death. OF COUNCILS.

Our Lord, who knew the wickedness of the priests, and that He should be crucified by them, never spoke against them as priests, but was subject to them, and bid those He cured go and shew themselves to them, and offer their gifts according to the law of Moses. Whatever He, or His Apostles, said of them as sinners, they never spoke against the priesthood, or against them as priests; and therefore it was blaspheming of Him, and slandering of them, in their table talk, to say, that the author of the Rights, in speaking against priests, did no more than Christ and His apostles did.

But to proceed; his way of exposing and deriding ecclesiastical synods, is in effect libelling all temporal senates, states, diets, and parliaments, and arguing against these, as well as them. He cannot but know that the senate of Rome, when a commonwealth, was so corrupt that they would have sold the city and citizens, if they could have found any to buy them, and that Tiberius the emperor, when he went out of the senate house, used to say aloud in Greek, *O homines ad servitutem paratos*[s]*!* And Petronius, in his verses of the civil wars, wrote thus of senate and people,

> ——— *emptique Quirites*
> *Ad prædam, strepitumque lucri suffragia vertunt;*
> *Venalis populus, venalis curia patrum*[t].

He knows how the Jewish Sanhedrim, which was their senate, killed the prophets, and crucified their Saviour, and murdered His disciples. But there is no need of having recourse to Jewish and heathenish assemblies of men upon this unhappy subject, Christian histories being full of examples of such meetings, wherein ambitious and designing men, and men of the worst principles and morals, have made most fierce and furious contentions, formed bloody parties, turned all civil

[s] [Tacit. Annal., lib. iii. c. 65.]
[t] [Tit. Petronii de Bello Civili, l. 39. Satyricon, c. 119.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VII.

order into confusion, and involved their countries in broils, wars, and desolation; "Reputation, and honour, shame, and disgrace, which," as our author speaks[u], "frequently influence single persons, having quite lost their force in such bodies" of men. I need not go abroad for instances, the direful history of the parliament, that begun in 1641, is a proof, a deplorable domestic proof, of what I say against him for asserting[x], that "the laity can have no motive, no temptation to abuse or corrupt religion to advance their temporal interest," and it will be a testimony against him in all ages to come. And an enemy of parliaments, after his ill logic, and worse example, may say in his words[y]; 'The conduct of parliaments is a sufficient demonstration against all their pretences of doing justice, since that cardinal and benign virtue is likelier to be found any where than in such assemblies; and it would be strange if right should be found to dwell where justice and humanity are seldom to be found.' Nay, if our author desires more examples, let him consult Prynne, his dear oracle Prynne, in his preface to the Abridgement of the Records[z], and in his Seasonable, &c. Vindication of the Liberties of English Freemen[a], and there he will find great plenty.

Nevertheless, though parliaments have sometimes been so factious in themselves, so unjust to private persons, and so mischievous to the kingdom, as he represents, yet all true Englishmen love the national constitution of parliaments,

[u] [Rights, p. 194.]

[x] [Ibid., p. 190.]

[y] [See Rights, p. 205.]

[z] [An exact abridgment of the records in the tower of London, as collected by Sir Robert Cotton, revised, &c. by William Prynne, Esq., 1657, Preface, § 12. It is observable that our] parliaments now and then, either out of hatred, envy, passion, or compliance with some potent, ambitious, popular swaying lords, and grandees, have most unjustly, illegally, condemned, executed, banished, fined, sentenced, oppressed sundry innocent, and some well-deserved persons, without just cause, trial, or due conviction of any real crimes.

§ 13. That all such parliaments and ambitious self-seekers in them, who under a pretence of public reformation, [liberty], the people's ease, welfare &c.

We may discern that as parliaments are the best of all courts [or] councils, when duly summoned, convened, constituted, ordered, and kept within their legal bounds, so they become the greatest mischiefs (and) grievances to the kingdom, when, like the ocean, they overflow their banks, or degenerate, and become through sedition, malice, faction, fear, or infatuation by Divine justice, promoters of corrupt sinister ends, or accomplishers of, &c.

[a] [Seasonable, legal, and Historical Vindication and Chronological collection of the good old fundamental liberties, rights, franchises, laws of all English Freemen, &c. 1654.]

and honour them, and submit to their laws, and other determinations which they make, though after much heat, and mighty discord and contention among themselves. OF COUNCILS.

In like manner the ancient Christian clergy and laity submitted to the laws and determinations of true and lawful councils and synods, which they made sometimes after long and great debates and contentions; because they knew that the care of the Church was committed, in whole as well as in part, jointly as well as severally, to the bishops, as governors of it under Christ, and that it belongs to them to make canons for the good government of the Church, and determine all disputes and differences arising therein. But our author, with his usual modesty, calls canons and determinations "impositions upon the people[b];" and so, if he pleases, he may say that the apostles and elders, who met in council at Jerusalem, and the Holy Ghost, who was present with them, 'imposed' upon the Gentiles abstinence from meats offered to idols, from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication. Nay, if it will do him any good, I can prove it for him from the original word ἐπιτίθεσθαι. "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to 'impose upon' you no greater burden than these necessary things." Indeed all orders, commands, and decrees of lawful superiors, are 'impositions,' and the canons and injunctions of the Church are in no other sense such, than all the acts, and edicts, and definitive sentences of kings or senates, or courts of last appeal in all the nations of the earth. This new way of arguing against ecclesiastical synods and councils[c], from the contentions which happen in them, hath a farther prospect than most readers will at first discern. For as the men who make a flourish with it are enemies of the clergy, and as their speaker, our author plainly tells us, would have the whole affair of religion managed by lay hands: so when they find their opportunity, they will turn it upon the first ministers of the Gospel, the Apostles, who they will have the impudence to say, first "pretended to the Spirit to sanctify what they did[d]," and to give colour to what they say. They will ask[e], "how the Spirit could be with men" who had such

Acts 15.

Acts 15. 28.

[b] [Rights, p. 191.]
[c] [Ibid., c. vi. p. 194.]
[d] [Ibid., p. 193.]
[e] [See Rights, pp. 205—207.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VII.

shameful divisions among themselves; sometimes for superiority, "who should be the greatest;" sometimes for trifles, as Luke 22.24. Paul with Barnabas; and sometimes about matters of religion, as Acts 15. 39. Gal. 2. 11. Paul with Peter, whom he withstood to his face? Nay, to discredit Christianity as much as they can, they will declaim with all their wit and malice upon the divisions, factions, and contentions [1 Cor. 1. 10.] in the Church of Corinth, planted by the Apostle himself. These scorners, when it will serve their turn, will make them, as well as the quarrels and contentions in councils, a common place for their scurrility; and, "I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas, and I of Christ," shall be an Herculean argument with them, that laymen would make much better Church governors than priests.

He saith[f], that "by the account which the orthodox give of the many Arian councils, one would think they were speaking of devils, and not of men." And let any man read the ecclesiastical historians, particularly but three short chapters in the first book of the Ecclesiastical History of Socrates[g], and the sixteenth chapter of the fourth, which he artfully conceals, and then let him judge, if, for their cruelty and lying, they deserved not to be so spoken of. [Gregory Nazianzen's twenty-fifth oration[h], and[i]] Arsenius's hand [are] enough to justify the most severe speeches of them, without [reciting] their barbarous persecutions and cruelties in the Arian reigns. Besides, the faithful always believed that heretics were acted and inspired by the devils; and so, according to the Jewish and Christian doctrine relating to the power those wicked spirits have over wicked men, I make no difficulty to speak of the author of the Rights, and such writers,

[f] Ibid., p. 194.

[g] [Socratis, Hist. Eccl., lib. i. c. xxvii—xxix. tom. ii. pp. 62—66. The first three chapters detail the calumnies of the Arian bishops, of the Eusebian party, against St. Athanasius, first before Constantine, and then in the council of Tyre, A.D. 355. They produced here a hand, which they affirmed was that of Arsenius, a Meletian bishop, who had, as they alleged, been killed by Athanasius. The appearance of Arsenius himself refuted the charge. The last chapter referred to, contains an instance of the cruelty of the Arian emperor Valens, who caused eighty of the orthodox clergy to be put on board a vessel, which was afterwards, when at sea, set on fire, and they burnt alive.]

[h] [S. Greg. Naz., Orat. xxxiii. (al. xxv.) Adversus Arianos, Op., tom. i. pp. 603, sqq. This oration contains a detailed history of the cruelties of the Arians.]

[i] [These words are inserted from the Supplement, 1715, No. 5. p. 8, as are the words "are" and "reciting" in brackets instead of "is" and "mentioning" of the third edition.]

as of men who are acted by the devils: for should Satan himself write books by the hands of men, he could not write with more spite and venom than they have done against the priesthood and the Church.

He cites a most false and malicious character of the first general council of Nice, out of Marvel's Historical Essay of Councils[k]; who was, as the reader may perceive by the citation itself, an utter enemy to the Nicene faith. Such also, or almost such, are many of the other writers which he cites in that chapter[l]; either utter enemies, or not true friends to the consubstantial doctrine; and how much Marvel hath misrepresented that council, may be seen in the account which Eusebius hath given of it in a few short chapters[m] (or that which Socrates hath given of it out of Eusebius[n]) in the Life of Constantine; as also out of Sozomen[o]. Those who do not understand the originals may see in the English translation of the ecclesiastical historians[p] how Eusebius calls the meeting of the council "the work of God[q]," and compares the bishops of which it consisted, to "a garland made of the finest flowers from all parts," and bound

[k] [Rights, p. 196. Where Tindal, in speaking of the council of Nice, says, "which yet, as Mr. Marvel justly observes, was a pitiful human business, attended with all the ill circumstances of other worldly affairs, conducted by a spirit of ambition and contention; the first, and so the greatest, œcumenical blow that by Christians was given to Christians. It was," says he, "their imposition of a new article or creed upon the Christian world, not being contained in express words of Scripture .... In digging thus for a new deduction they undermined the fabric of Christianity," &c. The extract is from "An Historical Essay concerning General Councils, Creeds, and Impositions in matters of Religion;" (Marvel's Works, vol. ii. pp. 142, 143. 4to. Lond. 1776,) which was appended to a work, written by Marvel against Dr. Francis Turner, afterwards bishop of Ely, and one of the seven bishops, entitled, "Mr. Smirke, or the Divine in mode," published in 1676, under the assumed name of Andreas Rivetus, an anagram of Res nuda Veritas. Turner had sent out "Animadversions on 'the Naked Truth,'" a pamphlet published anonymously by Dr. Herbert Croft, bishop of Hereford.]

[l] [The authors cited in that chapter (chap. vi.) are Le Clerc, Tillotson, Wake, Burnet, Chillingworth, and several anonymous writers.]

[m] De vita Constant., lib. iii. cap. iv. —xiii. [ap. Hist. Eccl., Reading, tom. i. pp. 578—584.]

[n] Socratis, Hist. Eccl., lib. i. cap. vii. viii. [ibid., tom. ii. pp. 15—26.]

[o] Sozomen, Hist. Eccl., lib. i. cap. xvii. xviii. sqq. [to the end of the book, ibid., tom. ii. pp. 35—43.]

[p] [The History of the Church, translated from the Greek of Eusebius, Socrates, and Evagrius, with a translation of Valesius' Annotations on those authors, fol. Camb. 1683.] Reprinted at London, 1709.

[q] [*ἐπειδὴ οὖν συνῆλθον οἱ πάντες, ἔργον ἤδη Θεοῦ τὸ πραττόμενον ἐθεωρεῖτο· οἱ γὰρ μὴ μόνον ψυχαῖς ἄλλα καὶ σώμασι καὶ χώραις καὶ τόποις καὶ ἔθνεσι πορρωτάτω διεστῶτες ἀλλήλων, ὁμοῦ συνήγοντο, καὶ μία τοὺς πάντας ὑπεδέχετο πόλις, οἷον τινα μέγιστον ἱερέων στέφανον ἐξ ὡραίων ἀνθέων καταπεποικιλμένον.*—Euseb. Vita Const., cap. vi. ibid., p. 579.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VII.

together with the bond of peace. "Some of them," he saith[r], "were adorned with the word of wisdom; others were venerable for the gravity of their lives, and their very great sufferings; and others for their modesty and moderation:" and of the three hundred and eighteen fathers who were assembled in that council, all but five agreed in that Nicene confession of faith[s]. There they will find what respect and deference the emperor paid to them, as to his spiritual fathers and superiors, and that the great animosities and contentions he found at first among them did not lessen his veneration for them[t]; for he was thoroughly instructed in the Christian religion[u], and did not only consider that Christians, and Christian priests, were men of passions, and subject to be tempted to strife by the devils; but also "looked upon sects," and parties, "and schisms" among themselves, "as arguments for the truth of Christianity, because they were foretold[v]." Indeed their divisions was neither matter of wonder or scandal to the wise among the Greeks, who knew that there were numerous divisions among the philosophers, and all other professors of arts and sciences, and therefore

[r] [*τῶν δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ λειτουργῶν οἱ μὲν διέπρεπον σοφίας λόγῳ· οἱ δὲ βίου στερρότητι καὶ καρτερίας ὑπομονῇ· οἱ δὲ τῷ μέσῳ τρόπῳ κατεκοσμοῦντο.* ibid., c. ix. p. 581. *μέσος τρόπος* sumi potest pro modestia et comitate morum, ut *μέσῳ* positum sit pro *μετρίῳ*. Vales. annot. in loc.]

[s] [*ταύτην τὴν πίστιν τριακόσιοι μὲν πρὸς τοῖς δεκαόκτω ἔγνωσάν τε καὶ ἔστερξαν· καὶ ὡς φησὶν ὁ Εὐσέβιος, ὁμοφωνήσαντες καὶ ὁμοδοξήσαντες ἔγραφον· πέντε δὲ μόνοι οὐ προσεδέξαντο.*—Socrat. Hist. Eccl., lib. i. c. viii. p. 22.]

[t] Euseb. de vita Const., lib. iii. cap. xxiii. [*μόνοις Αἰγυπτίοις ἄμικτος ἦν ἡ πρὸς ἀλλήλους φιλονεικία· ὡς καὶ αὖθις ἐνοχλεῖν βασιλέα· οὐ μὴν καὶ πρὸς ὀργὴν ἐγείρειν, οἷα γοῦν πατέρας, ἢ καὶ μᾶλλον προφήτας Θεοῦ, πάσῃ περιέπων τιμῇ, κ. τ. λ.*—ibid., p. 591.]

[u] Sozom. Eccles. Hist., lib. i. cap. iii. [ibid., tom. ii. pp. 12, 13. The chapter contains the account of Constantine's conversion, and the instruction then given him.]

[v] See the preface to the Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England, in Answer to her Adversaries, who reproach her with the English Heresies and Schisms. Printed for Walter Kettilby, in St. Paul's Church-yard. 1706. [and the Apol. Vindication itself, p. 21, &c. This work was originally a sermon preached by Hickes, on two successive Sundays, in London, on the publication of the "papers found in the late king's strong box," by King James II., in which our divisions were alleged as an argument against the English Church. His preaching this sermon led the king to shew Hickes the original MS. of the papers in Charles II.'s own hand. The sermon was afterwards enlarged, and published in 1686. In 1706 Hickes sent out this second edition, with many additions, an Appendix of papers relating to the schisms of the Church of Rome, and the Preface here referred to; the design of which is to expose the deistical principles which were then being put forth; particularly in two works, from which he gives extracts, An Account of the Growth of Deism, and The Principles of the Protestant religion in respect to Church communion; both of which are mentioned in the later part of this Discourse.]

the divisions among the bishops in the council of Nice was no bar to the conversion of two philosophers, who came with as much prejudice as curiosity to hear their debates[x]; and if our author's spite to priesthood would have let him, he might have learned more manners, if not more religion, than to treat Christian synods as he hath done, from a wise and ingenuous pagan, the philosopher Themistius, who, addressing himself to the Arian emperor Valens, to persuade him to moderate his cruel persecution of the faithful, told him[y], "He ought not to admire at the disagreement of opinions among Christians, which was but small, if compared with the multitude and confusion of opinion amongst the Greeks, among whom there were above three hundred sects." Nay, he prayed him to consider, that "the most excellent and useful arts had never arrived to such perfection, but by difference of judgment, and strife among the artists themselves; nay, that philosophy, the mother of all good arts, had risen from small beginnings to such a height of perfection, by differences and contentions among learned men." OF COUNCILS.

[x] [See Sozomen, Hist. Eccl., lib. i. c. xviii. tom. ii. p. 36. Hickes has been misled by the heading of the chapter, which is, 'De duobus philosophis ad fidem conversis,' &c. One of these only was converted at the council; by an able and simple-minded confessor, who enunciated the Christian doctrines, and added, *ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχειν ἀπεριέργως πιστεύομεν· μὴ τοίνυν μάτην πόνει, τῶν πίστει κατορθουμένων ἐλέγχους ἐπιζητῶν, καὶ τρόπον ᾧ γένεσθαι ταῦτα ἢ μὴ γένεσθαι ἐνεδέχετο· ἀλλ' εἰ πιστεύεις ἐρομένῳ μοι ἀποκρίνου· πρὸς ταῦτα καταπλαγεὶς ὁ φιλόσοφος, πιστεύω, φησί.* The same narrative is given, with some other circumstances, in Ruffinus, Hist. Eccl., lib. i. c. 3. Opuscula, pp. 196, 197. Paris. 1680. The other conversion is mentioned by Sozomen as a parallel instance; it took place at Constantinople on a different occasion. Socrates, Hist. Eccl., lib. i. c. viii. p. 20, speaks of the dialecticians generally being silenced by the simple lay confessor, who said, *ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, οὐ διαλεκτικὴν ἡμῖν παρέδοσαν τέχνην, οὐδὲ κενὴν ἀπάτην, ἀλλὰ γυμνὴν γνώμην, πίστει καὶ καλοῖς ἔργοις φυλαττόμενην.*]

[y] [*αὐτοῦ τὴν πολλὴν ἀπηνείαν ὁ φιλόσοφος Θεμίστιος μετριωτέραν τῷ προσφωνητικῷ λόγῳ* (oratione quæ *προσφωνητικὸς* in scribitur) *ἐν ᾧ μὴ δεῖν ξενίζεσθαι ἐπὶ τῇ διαφωνίᾳ τῶν Χριστιανικῶν δογμάτων παραινεῖ τῷ βασιλεῖ. μικρὰν γὰρ εἶναι τὴν αὐτῶν διαφωνίαν, ὡς πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος καὶ τῇν σύγχυσιν τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησι δογμάτων· εἶναι γὰρ ὑπὲρ τριακόσια δόγματα.*] Socrat., H. E., lib. iv. [cap. xxxii. ibid., p. 255. Hæc oratio Themistii ad Valentem, hodie extat Latine edita a Duditio. Nam quod Socrates ait Themistium in ea oratione locutum esse de discrepantia dogmatum Philosophicorum, habetur in Versione Duditii p. 507. (Orat. xii. Themistii Orationes ed. Petav. et Hardouin, p. 158. Paris. 1684.) "Artes quidem quarum magnus in vita usus et delectatio est, nunquam ad tantam sublimitatem et elegantiam pervenissent, nisi artificum inter ipsos discrepantia judiciorum et certamen quoddam extitisset. Quippe ipsa Philosophia, mater omnium laudandarum artium, ab exiguis orta principiis, nonne doctissimorum hominum dissensione ita crevit, ut ad ejus absolutionem nihil desiderari videatur?" Valesii annott. ad loc. This same passage is quoted in the Apologetical Vindication, p. 36.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VII.

But nothing will satisfy these men, whose reasons are perverted, and whose souls are poisoned to such a degree, with the *anti-Nicene* venom against priesthood and priests. If God had thought fit instead of men to make angels priests, that would not have pleased them. Then they would have arraigned His wisdom at the bar of their reason, for making Spirits priests, who had none of our passions, and by consequence could have no compassion for our infirmities. If they had preached and prayed among them as we do, and administered the same Sacraments, and come to visit them in their houses, familiarity would have bred the same contempt. When they preached up repentance, mortification, and self-denial, they would have cavilled, and said they preached what they did not understand; that they knew not our animal frame and carnal constitution; and that it was unreasonable to hear such doctrines from those who did not understand flesh and blood. Had they preached up non-resistance, they would have said they were devils, who out of spite to men, the noblest part of God's creation, had a mind to make all mankind slaves. Had they sometimes eat and drank with them, as the angels did with Abraham and Lot, they would have said they were gluttonous and wine-bibbers; but had they conversed with them, neither eating bread nor drinking wine, they would have said they were austere devils. Had they made canons, especially penitential canons, for the government of the Church, and put them in execution upon stubborn and contumacious sinners, they would have said they were Abaddons; that 'their pretended power clashed with the civil magistrates' power;' that it 'took from them the power of protecting their subjects;' that they 'took the practice of it from the heathen priests;' that it 'set up *imperium in imperio*,' and 'was sufficient to enslave all mankind[z].' Had they pretended to bind and loose sinners, then they would have said they could not be good but evil spirits, "who usurped the prerogative, and invaded the incommunicable rights of God;" assuming a power to themselves of "damning and saving, and making God no more than their executioner[a]." If they had met together and framed any confession of faith, especially in the words of that of the Nicene council, though

[z] [See Rights, pp. 29, 41, 43, 44.]

[a] [Ibid., pp. 66, 68.]

they had framed it with the same harmony and agreement in which the good angels live in heaven, they would have said, that "it was an imposition on the Christian world, not being contained in express words of Scripture; . . . that they undermined the fabric of Christianity by it; that they departed from the general rules of their religion in imposing of it, and violated our Saviour's institution of a Church, not subject to any additions in matters of faith[b];" and that as they had no idea of that doctrine, so it was nothing to them, "who are to judge for themselves, and act according to their judgment[c]:" and had they enjoined any rites or ceremonies, they would have said "they were for shows, and laid stress upon impertinencies which no ways influenced a good life[d]."

He censures the clergy for condemning King Henry VIII., for alienating the Church lands, and "those who possess them as guilty of sacrilege, for withholding them from the Church[e];" and so he might have censured many learned laymen too. And the reason he gives for censuring or rather ridiculing of them is this; that "they are now in the hands of the Church, and have been ever since the people were possessed of them," because the people in the Scriptures are called the Church. So the people of the city are called 'the city,' and if any of them should possess themselves of the city lands, they would be in the city still. So when an intruding president and fellows of Magdalene college in Oxford, sacrilegiously shared the founder's gold among them, the gold was in the college still. But if for Church lands, we put priests' lands, or bishops' lands, his sophism will appear to a child, though he hopes to deceive men with it; and as long as our bishops and priests enjoy the remainder of the Church lands, these men, if permitted, will be always thus writing against them. A stipendiary ministry, subject to a "staff and a pair of shoes[f]," is what they design to bring about by all their invectives against the clergy: and as they malign the Church for her lands, so they hate her

[b] Ibid., p. 196. [This is the conclusion of the quotation from Marvel's Hist. Essay of Councils. See note k, p. 151.]

[c] Ibid., Pref., p. lxxxv.

[d] Ibid., p. 212.

[e] Rights, p. 215.

[f] ["nothing being found more effectual to keep a pragmatical priest within bounds, than the fear of having a staff and a pair of shoes laid at his door."] Rights, p. 214.

synods for the sake of her doctrine, and are always for the same cause barking at the Universities[g], because they also have lands and are seminaries of the Church.

The narrow bounds of a preface will not give me leave to shew the many false turns he hath given to Church history in this chapter, and make the reflections which the authors he hath cited against ecclesiastical synods, as well as what he cites, deserve. I will only say I am sorry, and am ashamed to find that any divines of the Church of England should write in such manner as to deserve praises from him[h]; and I hope it will be matter of humiliation and repentance to them, when they find themselves adorned for writing such things by such men, whose commendations are flatteries, whose praises are dishonour, and whose characters, the more favourable they are, are the greater scandal and disgrace. Indeed it would be worth the while for some that have time, to make remarks on all the citations of his book. Some he would find cited out of authors who were known enemies to revealed religion; others which have been answered, without taking notice of the answers. Others he would find to be the errors of mistaken and well-meaning men; and others of clergymen, who to serve a design, have written things inconsistent with their characters and profession, as priests. Others again would appear to be but rash and passionate discharges of men who wrote in haste and heat; and others, which he triumphs in citing, would be found to be but singularities of a few opining writers, who are as much in love with their own dear notions, as Narcissus was with his own form. In the last place, others will be found to be nothing but the effusions of bile and venom against the fathers of the Greek and Latin Church upon the account of the Nicene or Constantinopolitan confession, of which I will give one example. "Mr. Le Clerc," saith he[i], "than whom there never was a

[g] [See Rights, pp. 221, sqq.]

[h] [Tindal speaks of "that great reformer and glorious martyr, Archbishop Cranmer," Rights, p. 178; "the late excellent Archbishop," (Tillotson,) p. 202. He repeatedly quotes Bishop Burnet with approbation, and says of the low Church clergy generally, "none can have a juster esteem for them than he," p. 303; but probably Wake is particularly alluded to by Hickes, whom Tindal calls "the judicious Dr. Wake," p. 200; "who, by his exemplary life, shews his zeal for religion; and for the Church, by his excellent defence of it against popery in the most dangerous times," pp. 203, 204. See also Preface to Rights, p. lxxxvi.]

[i] Rights, p. 169.

more impartial or abler judge, gives us a short yet lively picture of these times[j]: 'Weak princes, as far from being good as wise, assembled a pack of paltry Greeks, who had spent their lives in the art of cavilling about words without the least knowledge in things; so very fond of wrangling, that they were eternally in feuds among themselves. To these were added some few from the west, more stupid and ignorant indeed, but not a whit more honest; who after much scandalous quarrelling, did at last, by their own authority, establish certain unintelligible propositions, in such terms as were for the most part very improper, which the vulgar implicitly reverenced as most heavenly truths.' This, as severe as it seems, is softer than what the great Episcopius says of the councils, that they were 'led on by fury, faction, and madness[k].'" I need make no reflections on these modest characters of the emperors, and the Greek and Latin fathers, of the fourth and fifth century. Not to mention Theodosius Junior, and Marcian; Constantine the Great, and Theodosius the Great, are here set forth as great fools and very wicked princes; and the fathers of the two first general councils, not to mention any of their great names, were a pack of paltry, cavilling, stupid fellows, boobies, and knaves, that knew nothing but how to quarrel and brawl. Good God! that the Christian world should be misled for so many ages by such worthless, ignorant sort of men; that our reformers, and all our learned divines since the Reformation, should retain such veneration for them, and not only declare that their confession of faith, with "the Apostles' creed, and the creed commonly called the creed of St. Athanasius ought to be received and believed, because they may be proved by holy Scripture[l];" but also

[j] Ars Critica. [pars 2. sect. ii. c. 5. § 18. ed. 2. Amst. 1700.] See more to the same purpose by the same author, cited by the learned Dr. Cave in his Vindication of Eusebius from Arianism against Le Clerc, p. 1. [Cave published a dissertation De Eusebii Cæsariensis Arianismo adversus Johannem Clericum; as the last of three dissertations appended to the second part of his Historia Literaria. Lond. 1698. Le Clerc replied in a work entitled "Epistolæ Criticæ et Ecclesiasticæ," &c. which formed the third volume of the second edition of his Ars Critica. Amst. 1700. Cave in the same year sent out an Epistola Apologetica, &c. in qua argumenta ejus pro Eusebii Arianismo ad examen revocantur, &c. Lond. 1700. This was reprinted at the end of the second volume of the Historia Literaria, in the edition published at Oxford in 1743. The dissertation first mentioned is the work to which Hickes refers; p. 1 of that dissertation is p. 42 of the three dissertations in the edition of 1743.]

[k] [This subject is referred to in the later part of this Discourse.]

[l] Art. viii.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VII.

make them a part of our religious worship. This is their secret intolerable grievance; this, and absolute non-resistance, is that which provokes them to write with so much scorn and bitterness against the clergy. Would the English convocation but damn the creeds, which assert the Holy Trinity, and the non-resisting doctrine, then these men would invert their style, and write of our order as most Divine, and say as glorious things of us all, as for their own purpose they say of some[m].

SECT. VIII. On Church censures.

It would require a great deal of time and paper, to shew our author's fallacies and contradictions; and how, under the name of 'high Church,' he hath written from one end of his book to the other against the Church of England[n]; contrary to her doctrine and discipline, in her articles, canons and homilies, in which she asserts the power of the keys, and the clergy to have that power; as the bishop of Sarum writes in the preface to his Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England[o]: "But our Church still owns the power of the keys[p], which is not only doctrinal, when the mercies of God are declared, or His judgments denounced; but it is also authoritative and ministerial, by which all Christians are either admitted to, or rejected from the privileges of Church communion, and their sins are bound or loosed. With this we assert the pastors of the Church are vested." That the

[m] [See notes h, p. 156, and m, p. 55.]

[n] [Tindal professed only to oppose the high Church views, (see note p, p. 72.) "It was to defend the Church of England against the papists, Jacobites, and other highfliers, that caused me to engage in this controversy."—Rights, p. 303. "Nothing is more disputed at present, than who is the best Churchman, both high and low Church laying claim to it; and therefore it cannot be doubted but both will approve my design in setting this dispute in a fair light, and shewing what is meant by the Church of England as by law established: wherein I shall make it appear, that they who raise the greatest noise about the danger of the Church are the greatest enemies to it," &c.—Preface to Rights, § 1. p. i. "And now I have nothing further to add than to desire the reader to take notice, that though in the following discourse I use the word clergy in general, I would not be understood to mean those who maintain the principles of our established Church; but the popish, eastern, presbyterian, and Jacobite clergy, (who are infinitely the majority,) as well as too many who pretend to be of the Church of England, falling into notions inconsistent with our legal establishment."—Ibid., p. lxxxiv.]

[o] [A Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England, in which it is demonstrated that all the essentials of ordination, according to the practice of the primitive and Greek Churches, are still retained in our Church. In answer to a paper written by one of the Church of Rome to prove the nullity of our orders and given to a person of quality; by Gilbert Burnet.—Preface, London, 1677.]

[p] Art. xxxiii.

ON CHURCH CENSURES.

pastors of the Church are vested by God with such a power is plain from the sense and practice of the Christians, as expressed by Tertullian in these words[q]: "We Christians are a corporation or society of men, most strictly united by the same religion, by the same rites of worship, and animated by one and the same hope. When we come to the public service of God, we come like an army, as if we were to storm heaven by the force of our prayers; and this force is grateful violence to God. . . . We meet together likewise for reading the holy Scriptures. . . . In these assemblies also we exhort, reprove, and pass the Divine censure (of excommunication). For the judgments in this place are delivered with all gravity and solemnity, as among men who are sure they stand in the presence of God. And the judgment here pronounced against delinquents (*summum futuri judicii præjudicium est*) is the last previous sentence of the judgment to come against him, who hath sinned to such a degree, as to be excluded from our assemblies, and from the communion of prayers and other religious commerce. The presbyters, who preside in these assemblies, are raised to this dignity, not by money, but the testimony of their lives," &c.

Here it is plain, that the Christians of the second century looked upon the censured sinner as precondemned by God; and that the sentence of excommunication, and by consequence of absolution, was not only declarative, but judicial; not that they "assumed the power of damning and saving[r]," as he speaks with a face of brass, or "invaded the incommunicable attributes of God[s];" but that God was pleased, as under the law, so under the gospel, to bind or loose sinners by the ministry of men; and had He done it by the ministry of angels, as I observed before, had He said to those blessed spirits, or any appointed number of them, "Whosesoever [John 20. 23.]

[q] Apol., c. 39. [Corpus sumus de conscientia religionis, et disciplinæ unitate, et spei fœdere. Coimus ad Deum, quasi manu facta precationibus ambiamus. Hæc vis Deo grata est . . . Coimus ad literarum divinarum commemorationem. . . . Ibidem etiam exhortationes, castigationes, et censura divina. Nam et judicatur magno cum pondere, ut apud certos de Dei conspectu, summumque futuri judicii præjudicium est, si quis ita deliquerit, ut a communicatione orationis, et conventus, et omnis sancti commercii relegetur. Præsident probati quoque seniores, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio adepti; neque enim pretio ulla res Dei constat.—Tertull., Apol. c. 28. (al. 39.) Op., p. 31, A. ed. Ben.]

[r] [Rights, p. 68.]

[s] [Ibid., p. 69.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VIII.

[Matt. 18. 18.]

sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained;" and "whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven:" I say, had He been pleased to give this power of the keys to any order or number of the holy angels, these enemies of priestly power might have said the same thing. I hope in my second letter I have proved this doctrine, relating to the power of the keys, by sufficient authorities[t], particularly by the censure of St. Ambrose upon Theodosius the Great; which as it was submitted to by the emperor upon Christian principles, and never condemned by any Church, of that, or after ages: so is it highly approved by ours, in the second part of the Homily of the Right Use of the Church, where are these words[u]; "And, according to this example of our Saviour Christ, in the primitive Church which was most holy and godly, and in the which due discipline with severity was used against the wicked, open offenders were not suffered once to enter into the house of the Lord, nor admitted to common prayer, and the use of the holy Sacraments, with other true Christians, until they had done open penance [before] the whole Church. And this was practised not only upon mean persons, but also upon [the] rich, noble, and mighty persons; yea upon Theodosius, that puissant and mighty emperor, whom, for committing a grievous and wilful murder, St. Ambrose, bishop of Milan, reproved sharply, and did also excommunicate the said emperor, and brought him to open penance. And they that were so justly exempted, and banished as it were from the house of the Lord, were taken, as they be indeed, for men divided and separated from Christ's Church, and in most dan-

1 Cor. 5. 5.

gerous estate, yea, as St. Paul saith, 'even given unto Satan' the devil, for a time; and their company was shunned and avoided of all godly men and women, until such time as they by repentance and public penance were reconciled." I have set forth this proceeding of St. Ambrose against the emperor Theodosius at large[x], and of his humble behaviour during all

[t] [Second Discourse, on the Dignity of the Episcopal Order, chap. i. sect. iii. iv.]

[u] [Second Book of Homilies, Hom. i. part 2. p. 162. Oxford, 1832.]

[x] In the Second Letter. [On the Dignity of the Episcopal Order, chap. i. sect. iv. § 4.]

the time he was debarred from entering into the Church, which was a lesser sort, or lower degree, of excommunication. The religious emperor, as well as the holy father, knew that the power of the keys was committed to a particular order of men for maintaining and upholding the kingdom of God in the kingdoms of the world, and for preserving the authority of His ministers therein, and that priests and people, standing in awe of that spiritual power, might be afraid to do any thing that would dishonour their spiritual society and profession, or give offence to the Jews, or to the Gentiles, or to the Church of God. The clergy of all Churches ought to take care to preserve this power in purity and force, and not to let it fall into decay, or desuetude, or suffer by irregular administration, lest God should not only call them to an account for their stewardship in this world, and in judgment take it from them, but condemn them in the next, as mal-administrators of His kingdom upon earth, and traditors of the trust He hath committed to them. I fear the nonuser and abuser of this sacred power in the Church of England, hath been a great ingredient in the judgments that formerly, and of late, have fallen upon it, and particularly of the progressive contempt of her clergy, and growing number of her enemies. For the neglect of using this power, to the great and holy end for which God hath appointed it, and using of it, when it is administered, in such manner as is not agreeable to the holy nature and solemnity of such a Divine institution, I may justly say, are the 'high-places' that yet 'remain' in the Church of England, which ought always and by all means, in season and out of season, to endeavour the restoration of the ancient godly discipline in its purity, in conjunction with her Apostolical government, and purity of doctrine and worship: and would the governors of the Church, in sincerity and the sense of their duty, go about this good work, which is wanting to complete our reformation, God, I trust, would give success to their faithful endeavours; and when it was done, He would with the pure, strict, ancient discipline, restore the Church and her clergy to their ancient veneration; He would then multiply the number of her friends, as fast as He hath suffered her enemies to increase; nay, then He would make her enemies, her worst enemies, even such as is the author of

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VIII.

the Rights, and his accomplices, the disciples of Spinoza, to be at peace with her, and become her good friends.

Every one who reads his book must needs observe how he sets himself with all the sophistry he hath, to argue against the ecclesiastical discipline, and, in such a manner as becometh himself, against the power of excommunication, from some corruptions in the exercise and execution of it, which the clergy bewail as much as he ridicules, and which by consequence have been, and still are, much more the misfortune, than the fault of the Church. It was bewailed by Edward Fox[y], bishop of Hereford, before the Reformation, in a treatise concerning the division between the spirituality and temporalty[z], of which I have seen an English translation by Henry Stafford, son of Edward duke of Buckingham, printed by Robert Redman at London[a]. In this treatise the bishop sets forth with great faithfulness and grief the corruptions both of the regulars and seculars; which I observe for the honour of the clergy, who never palliated or concealed the

[y] Edw. Foxus [natione Anglus, Cantabrigiæ regalis Collegii socius, et in eadem Academia Sacræ Theologiæ Doctor: denique successu temporis] Episcopus Herefordensis, vir eloquentiæ laude præstans, prudentissimus etiam et gravis, [in dirigendis et expediendis arduis negotiis cum judicio promptus et dexter. Unde Rex Angliæ Henricus octavus hujus viri opera, in variis legationibus in Italiam et in Germaniam usus est, et quidem satis commode. Item] nobilissimus Heros Henricus Dominus de Staffordio virum hunc mire coluit, et in gratiam auctoris aliqua ejus opera ex Latino in Anglicum vertit sermonem. Ex iis quæ scripsit hæc pauca saltem invenio, Differentiam utriusque status et potestatis [librum unum.] Quem in Anglicum vertit ipse Staffordius. Pitsius [de Illustribus Angliæ Scriptoribus] ad An. 1530. n. 930.

Henricus Staffordius, Edwardi illustrissimi Ducis Buckinghamiæ filius, vir felicis ingenii, et in melioribus quibusque disciplinis insigniter eruditus, &c. Illud unum mihi constat eum e Latino in Anglicum sermonem eleganter vertisse Edwardi Foxi Præsulis Herefordensis opus de Differentia Potestatis Ecclesiasticæ et Secularis. [obiit anno post nativitatem Christi 1558.] Id., ad ann. 1558. [n. 1008.]

[z] [The title of the book is Opus Eximium de vera differentia regiæ potestatis et ecclesiasticæ, ac quæ sit ipsa veritas de virtute utriusque. Londini; in ædibus Tho. Bartholeti. 1533. It is directed against the authority of the pope, and to maintain that of the king, in spirituals.]

[a] [There was also an edition of this translation printed by William Copeland in 1548. Fox was a statesman, introduced by Wolsey, and himself introducing Cranmer to the court. "He was almoner to the king, and reputed, Burnet says, 'one of the best divines in England.' He was the principal pillar of the Reformation, as to the politic and prudential part of it; being of more activity and no less ability than Cranmer himself; but he acted more secretly than Cranmer, and therefore did not bring himself into danger of suffering on that account. He was Henry's ambassador to the Protestant princes at Smalcalde, sent to urge them to an union with England against Rome. Lloyd (State Worthies) represents him as a fine preacher, but adds, that his inclination to politics brake through all the ignoble restraints of pedantic studies, to an eminency that made him the wonder of the university, and the darling of the court."—Chalmers' Biogr. Dict.]

faults of their own order, in former or later ages, as may be seen in the works of Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Hierom, Ambrose, &c., not to mention the councils, to which our author hath an implacable enmity, and many writers even of the latter and most corrupt ages of the Church. It is out of the writings of clergymen, that he hath picked up his discoveries of the corruption of the clergy, which I observe again in bar and abatement to his accusations, which he brings against the whole order, without distinction of good from bad. ON CHURCH CENSURES.

Wherefore his malicious reflections upon the reformable mal-administration of Church censures are no argument against them, unless it be good logic to argue against the goodness of a thing, from the abuse of it, which may be reformed. The foundation of his argument against them is purely verbal and precarious, in such suppositions and expressions as this; "their pretending to a judicial power;" "their assuming to themselves a jurisdiction in contradistinction to the magistrate's[b]:" so, if he pleases, he may say their "assuming to themselves a power" of making a man a member of Christ, a child of God, and an heir of the kingdom of heaven. But in this way of speaking of the sacerdotal power he begs the question, which, as I observed before, is a question of fact, whether God hath not given His ministers such a power and jurisdiction? and if He have, then all his arguments *ab incommodo* upon the civil power, were they true, would fall to the ground. The king or queen is the supreme magistrate in this kingdom, and in his way of arguing he may write another book against some parts of our constitution, and the rights, and grants, and privileges of societies, as well as single persons; because in many cases they so limit and restrain the royal power, and, as he phrases it, "take from the sovereign the power of protecting his subjects;" as for example, if the college, of which he is a member, will expel him[c], neither the supreme magistrate, nor all the magistrates in the kingdom, can hinder them, or protect him from expulsion. If the lower house of parliament will send one of their members to the tower, or impeach a peer,

[b] [Rights, p. 65.]

[c] [vid. note a, p. 48. Tindal was on one occasion formally reprimanded by his college for gross incontinency.—Biogr. Brit., art. Tindal.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VIII.

though never so great a favourite of the sovereign, neither he, nor all the magistrates of the kingdom can hinder it, or protect them; and if human constitutions can so restrain, and tie up the hands of the regal power, may not God by His divine constitutions do the same? Is it such a strange thing that the Church should have the power, which every society, every college, every company, every university hath to turn out their incorrigible, and contumacious members, or members who commit such crimes for which by the charter or statutes they ought to be expelled[c]? Every father of a family hath power, or, as he is pleased to express it, "assumes a power to himself," of turning a disobedient son or servant, independently of the magistrate, out of his house; and may not the fathers of the Church exercise the same power, which God hath given them, and expects they should exercise, upon open, scandalous, or obstinate sinners, as they will be answerable therefore to Him at the day of judgment? The question therefore is, whether or no God hath vested them with this power, or whether they have "assumed it to themselves?" And the reader is left to judge, whether he will believe antiquity, universality, and consent, the ancient, universal, and unanimous testimony of the Catholic Church, or this upstart number of novelists, who are enemies to the Christian faith and religion, as well as the priesthood, because priests are ordained for the defence thereof.

But he saith[d], "if the power of excommunication belongs independently to the clergy, then the magistrate could neither banish, imprison, or put a man to death, because it would deprive him of the communion of the Church." By communion, he means actual communion, or "communicating," as he otherwise expresses himself, and then here is a dainty argument indeed, which proves abundantly too much, and by consequence nothing at all. For if this be a true argument against the sacerdotal power of excommunication, then a Christian must not live and trade in a country, where there are no Christian meetings for worship, or such Christian meetings with which he cannot join; because, as he speaks, "it would hinder him not only from communicating with his own Church, but with all the Churches in the world[e]." For

[c] [See note c, preceding page.] [d] Rights, p. 38. [ch. i. § 9.] [e] [Ibid.]

the same reason a faithful Christian must not go a long voyage in a Turkish or Indian ship, or a vessel only manned with quakers; or in a journey, rest on the Lord's day where there is no Church. In these cases, as in close imprisonment, or banishment to desert islands, the prisoners and exiled persons want indeed the benefit of actual communion, but they have the comfort of being in a state of communion with all the Churches in the world. And as for the want of actual communion, if their close confinement or banishment is just, they are justly deprived of it, as any other criminal in close imprisonment is of the enjoyment of his family; but if they be unjust, then the Church, which protects no man from the power of the magistrate, teaches submission and passive obedience, and leaves the unrighteous magistrate (who is here supposed to be supreme) to answer for his unrighteousness to God.

His next Herculean argument against the sacerdotal power of excommunication is taken from the effect of it, because excommunicate persons are to be avoided until they return to the Church[f]. This he sets forth in most tragical manner[g], without saying that it extends not to near relations, as husbands, wives, children, servants, or subjects, nor to cases of necessity, or cases of conversing with excommunicates for their admonition, instruction, and edification[h]. However, this

[f] [Article XXXIII. Of excommunicate persons, how they are to be avoided. That person which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an heathen and publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a judge that hath authority thereunto.]

[g] Rights, pp. 39—41.

[h] [Decret., Pars 2. caus. xi. qu. 3. § 103. Quoniam multos. (a decree of Gregory VII.) Ab anathematis vinculo eos subtrahimus, videlicet uxores, liberos, servos, ancillas, seu mancipia, necnon rusticos servientes, et omnes alios qui non adeo curiales sunt, ut eorum consilio scelera perpetrentur.

The canonists express the exceptions derived from this decree, in the line,

Utile, lex, humile, res ignorata, necesse.

1. . . . Utilitas, tum temporalis tum spiritualis tam excommunicati, quam communicantis. Sic enim propter utilitatem spiritualem excommunicati licet eum verbis et facto exhortari ad ejus conversionem et resipiscentiam.

2. . . . per ly *lex* indicata est matrimonium. . . .

3. Tertia causa, per ly *humile* intimata est subjectio, ratione cujus liberi cum parentibns excommunicatis, servi et subditi cum dominis, vel superioribus suis, milites cum ducibus belli communicare non prohibentur, et sicut ex contra. . . .

4. Quarta causa, per ly *res ignorata*, indigitata est ignorantia tam juris quam facti. . . .

5. Quinta causa, per ly *necesse* indicata est necessitas quæcunque notabilis sive se teneat ex parte communicantis, vel alterius.—Vid. Reiffenstuel's Jus Canonicum, and the canonists referred to by him, tom. iv. p. 404. Antw. 1755.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VIII.

avoiding of excommunicates, he saith[i], "doth not only deprive them of their employments and professions, but if strictly put in execution, would cause them to lead lives more to be dreaded than death itself, and at last to perish most miserably." How false this is, appears from the exceptions just now mentioned, in which conversation and commerce with excommunicates is not forbidden. But admitting all he saith were strictly true, I must tell him, that all this misery would be the effect of the excommunicate's contumacy and stubbornness, and not of the excommunication; because the Church is always ready to receive him upon repentance; this power of her priests being not for destruction, but emendation and edification, as we shall hereafter see. He cannot but know, that other civil societies, particularly the universities, have a power like this, which they exercise in excommuning the citizens and magistrates of Oxford and Cambridge, when their rights, privileges, and immunities are invaded by them; but they do not this with an intention to hurt them or their families, but to reduce them to reason, being always ready to take off their prohibition of the scholars to trade with them, as soon as they remove the cause; and what any of them suffers in the mean time by being excommuned, his sufferings are properly from himself. I need not make any application of this power to that of the Church, only I would ask our author, first, whether it is a "power of life and death," (as the other, he saith[k], is, in the clergy;) because perhaps a stubborn townsman may bring himself to poverty for want of trade, by his own stubbornness? And, secondly, whether God may not give the like power to His ministers of commanding the people, for the benefit and honour of His Church, in all places to avoid the conversation of excommunicates till they are reconciled? Let us see what we can find to this purpose in the Scriptures; I say in the Scriptures, which he very seldom cites in his book. In Matt. xviii. 15—18, our Lord gives a rule to His disciples of proceeding with an injurious brother. First He directs to tell him of his fault privately, then to admonish him before one, or two, or more; and if he could not be brought to reason by neither of those ways, then to tell it to the Church;

[i] [Rights, p. 39.]

[k] Ibid.

but if he neglected to hear the Church, then they were to look upon him as a heathen and publican, that is, as one no longer fit to be conversed with. Now, supposing this were only a permission, and not a strict command, yet what our Lord permitted, the governors of the Church have power to enjoin; and the author of the Rights may in his way of arguing against shunning excommunicates, say the same thing against our Lord's directions here, that it "deprives men of their professions and other men's assistance, and if strictly put in execution, would make them lead lives more to be dreaded than death, and at last perish most miserably." The same he may say of the Apostle's command to the Romans (chap. xvi. 17), of "marking them who cause divisions and offences, and to avoid them;" and of his injunction to the Corinthians (1 Cor. v. 9, 11) "not to keep company with open fornicators, idolaters, drunkards, railers, and extortioners, with such no not to eat." So in 2 Thess. iii. 14, it was his command, that "if any obeyed not his word in that epistle, they should note that man, and have no company with him, that he might be ashamed." So St. John, in his second Epistle, commanded the Christians to whom he wrote it, that if any came among them under the name of Christians, and did not confess that Christ was come in the flesh, that they should not "receive them into their houses, nor so much as salute them." If they had power to prohibit Christians to keep company with such open scandalous sinners that they might be ashamed, then I hope they had power for the same good end to command them to avoid excommunicates, and that this power is still in their successors, to whom the power of the keys belongs. I presume it is reasonable to think, that the Corinthians, who were to shun the incestuous person before excommunication, did avoid him afterwards, what inconvenience soever he suffered by it, while he was refractory and stood out. Every one who knows the discipline of the primitive times, must know how strictly these directions and commands of our Lord and His Apostles were observed; and, for my own part, I think them so binding upon my conscience, that I should think myself obliged to have no commerce or conversation with the author of the Rights, and some other writers as bad as he, men-

[2 John ver. 10.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VIII.

tioned in "The Axe laid to the Root of Christianity[l]," excepting in the cases above mentioned, and to shun them in all places; and wherever I by chance met them, not to "bid them God speed," or to sit down at a table to a "feast" where there were such "spots." But to expose and exaggerate with all his power the severity of this godly discipline, and make it as odious as he can, he saith[m], "The magistrate is not exempt from it, since he is an ecclesiastical subject, but may be reduced to this miserable condition of being avoided and shunned by his soldiers and others, on pain of being delivered to Satan." How false this is, appears from the exceptions before mentioned[n]; the duty of shunning excommunicates not extending to natural, domestic, or civil relations, or to discharge any child, or servant, or subject, or soldier from his duty to his domestic, civil, or military superior, though he were not only an excommunicate, but an apostate; and therefore as this discipline doth not affect a magistrate of any sort in his domestic, so neither in his civil or military capacity; but as all his children must obey, and all his servants attend him within doors, so must all his subjects obey him, all his officers attend him, and all his soldiers march and fight in obedience to his orders without. He must still have his lictors, and still ride in his curule chair; and to be short, he is the same magistrate after, as he was before, excommunication, and must have the same duty paid him by his inferiors in their several relations and posts. In a word, his full charge against this discipline is false, for 'it deprives' no man 'of all converse,' as he saith[o], nor is any man "left by it alone and solitary in the midst of mankind."

[Jude ver. 12.]

Then he goes on[p] to reflect on the censures of the Church for "trifling causes, for which the penalty of excommunication is commonly inflicted." Here again is his mobbish fallacious way of arguing against the use of power from the abuse of it, which, if it were true, would argue down all domestic, civil, and military power in the world. But, I must tell him, if those he calls trifling causes were examined, they would be found to be the weighty causes of contempt and contu-

[l] [See note k, p. 53.]
[m] Rights, p. 39. [chap. i. § 9.]
[n] [See p. 165. and note h.]
[o] Ibid., p. 41. [§ 11.]
[p] Ibid., p. 44. [§ 17.]

macy, when refractory persons will not own the judgment and authority of the ecclesiastical courts, or submit to them, though but in so small a matter as "a groat, or a shilling[q]."

In the next place, he saith[r], that "if excommunication belongs by Divine right to the clergy, then the magistrate hath not all power necessary for the protection of his subjects, because, by the terror of this dreadful punishment, they drive the most useful citizens and their trades into foreign parts, to the ruin of the commonwealth." To which I answer, as formerly, whether it belongs to them, or no, is a question of fact; and if it doth, as indeed it doth belong to them, then the terror of the punishment is no argument against it. For all punishments of all sorts are more or less terrible, and the argument is as good against the civil as the ecclesiastical power. What a powerful declaration could he make against *aquæ, et igni interdicere*[s]*?* and how finely could he harangue it against the dreadful power of making acts of attainder, or against the powers that kings and sovereign estates have of forbidding their subjects, under the pain of death, to harbour or receive traitors and rebels, by which, he may say, they drive the noble peers, the worthiest gentlemen, the best patriots, and the most useful citizens, and their trades, into foreign parts, to the ruin of the commonwealth? But secondly, if by the terror of excommunication he means the terror of it as a pure spiritual punishment, that can drive none into foreign parts, because an excommunicate at home is as much an excommunicate abroad, all the Christian world over, being bound by the sentence wherever he goes; though he should "take the wings of the morning, and fly into the uttermost parts of the sea," even there his excommunication will hold him, as well as in his own country, and he shall be bound both in heaven and earth. But if by the terrible nature of it he means, as I suppose he doth, the civil punishments that attend it by the laws of Christian countries, then it is not the clergy, but the magistrates themselves, who are judges of the public good, that drive out the most useful

[q] Preface to Rights, p. xlv.

[r] Rights, p. 44. [chap. i. § 18.]

[s] ['Aquæ et igni interdictio,' the ancient Roman formula for banishment, by which a person was forbidden the use of fire and water, and so exiled from within certain limits, but might go to any other place.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VIII.

citizens and their trades into foreign parts, to the ruin of the commonwealth.

Then he saith[t], "If the clergy met in council may determine for the Christian world, when they shall eat, and when not;" that is, appoint times of fasting and abstinence, "and can forbid the use of flesh, and excommunicate all who disobey them, why may they not assume the same power about drinks, and clothes, of rising, or going to bed, or working, or not working, which is included in appointing holy days." Here is still the same fallacy again of arguing against lawful power from the abuse of it in those that have it; and his argument is as good in the same instances against the temporal as the spiritual power. Thus the dissenters argue against the power of the Church in imposing ceremonies, because if the Church have power of imposing, as they call enjoining, ceremonies, it may as well impose ten thousand, as one or two; but power is always lodged somewhere, and if those in whom it is vested will abuse it, by grievous and insolent impositions, they must be answerable for it to their superiors on earth; or, if they be supreme, to the great God in heaven. Nay, this way of arguing will divest a father of a family of all his authority, who may make himself very uneasy to his domestics, by tyrannical impositions in the same instances.

But the question, as I must still observe, is a question of fact, whether the governors of the Church have a power to appoint times of abstinence and fasting, and of appointing holy days, and in some cases of giving orders about clothes, or not. And when our author will desire me, I think I shall be able to prove that she hath such power, particularly as to clothes, which our author thinks the greatest of absurdities: 1 Cor. 11. 15. the Apostle commanded the Corinthian women to be veiled, or covered in Divine service; the Church in the best and purest ages commanded the same[u]; and if for the same reason the convocation should ordain it now, after his and their examples, and according to their excellent discipline, I think they would do what would be for their honour, and the good of souls. I once saw the greatest queen of Europe quit all

[t] Rights, p. 47. [§ 22.]

[u] [See Bingham, book xiii. chap. viii. sect. 9, and Tertullian, de Virginibus Velandis, Op., p. 172.]

the state in which she came to church, at the church door, and there pull her hoods over her face, which she put up again when she came out; and if our clergy in convocation should forbid men and women to go to church, as they scandalously do, in the same habits and dresses as they go to balls and plays, all serious Christians, I believe, would obey their orders with joy; and our churches would then look more like the houses, and our Divine service more like the worship of God, and our congregations would then appear so venerable in the eyes of our adversaries, that they, instead of reproaching them with too much cause, would be forced to report that 'God was in them and among them of a truth.' If the lord chamberlain of the court hath power to command all the king or queen's household, or those who attend there, to wear nothing but mourning apparel upon mournful occasions, [and even to cover their coaches and chairs, so that not a brass nail shall appear; and if the lord marshal hath power to order the same for all peers, as we see it often done, shall it be such an intolerable imposition in our spiritual governors to command the people, who ought to be obedient to them, to clothe themselves in a manner suitable to[v]] times of penitence and humiliation, when it would be very incongruous for Christians to appear at the public assemblies in rich and splendid apparel, and give themselves contrary airs to penitential sorrow, I mean the airs of splendour, festivity, and joy. [Such commands of our spiritual governors are so far from being tyrannical impositions, that their authority would bear them out, if they should upon such occasions command the people to clothe themselves with sackcloth, to testify their humiliation, vileness, sorrow, and abhorrence of their sins[x].] But without any proof he still begs the question about the power of the clergy, saying of it in these as well as other instances, that they "assume" it. "They," saith he, "who can assume such a power to themselves, what will they not, unless sufficiently curbed, pretend to[y]?" And 'he,' may a mutinous son of a family say in like manner to his father, 'who can assume such a power to him-

[v] [Supp., 1715, No. 7. p. 9. In the third edition, after "mournful occasions," "shall it be such an intolerable grievance in our spiritual governors to do the same in times," &c.]

[x] [Supp., 1715, No. 8. p. 9.]

[y] [Rights, p. 47. § 22.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VIII.

self, what will he not do, unless he is curbed? If I should take up one pin when he bids me, he may bid me take up pins all the day long. If he forbids us the use of flesh one day, he may forbid it all the year, and turn us out of doors for disobeying him, and then why may he not assume the same power about drink and clothes? These are intolerable "impositions on the liberties of mankind[z]." "

In another place he saith[a], that "The arguments which the clergy use for their spiritual jurisdiction will give them the cognizance of all causes, and a right to excommunicate for one sin as well as another, and consequently of invading of property . . . and rebellion; which would make them judges to whom right and allegiance belonged, and subject all public and private causes to their determination." To which I answer, This is as false as it is invidious; for the Church hath always disclaimed and renounced all right to hear, or try causes of civil cognizance and property, between subjects or rival princes, as not belonging to her tribunals and authority, after the example of her Lord and Saviour, who, when one of His disciples said unto Him, "Master, speak to my brother, that he may divide the inheritance with me;" answered, "Who made Me a judge or divider over you?" The Church, our Saviour's kingdom, though it is in the world, yet "is not of the world," and her governors, as such, have nothing to do with worldly suits and trials; nor, as such, can they judge of right or wrong in public or private capacities, except in cases of notoriety of fact, which need neither trial, witnesses, or proof, and of which every man is judge as well as they. In these cases they may exercise their jurisdiction, and excommunicate open rebels and raptors, for their sins, till the one lay down their arms, and the other make restitution. And if a bishop should so censure a man, who at noonday, in the sight of a thousand people, should do to this man, as the Sabeans and Chaldeans did to Job, or it may be worse, plunder his house, and carry his wife and children (if he have any) away captive, I believe he would think that bishop did not only what he had power, but what he ought to do, and would think himself obliged to give him thanks. The Church hath power to do the same after the criminal's

[Luke 12. 13, 14.]

[John 18. 36.]

[z] Rights, p. 47. § 22.

[a] Ibid., pp. 45, 46. § 19.

trial, where the proof was certain and undoubted, to bring him by the terror of her censures to repentance; but if despising them, he will live and die obstinate and impenitent, he will go bound to God's tribunal, which is the last resort from the censures of the Church.

He also thinks[b] he argues finely against the jurisdiction and censures of the clergy, as "manifestly unjust, because they subject the same person to undergo two trials, and to be punished twice for the same crime." To which I answer, That it is not absolutely and manifestly unjust for a man to be subject, under the same power and in the same society, to have two trials, or to be twice punished for the same crime, much less under different powers. For first, it is neither against the laws of nature or the fundamental rules of policy, that in some cases a man may be subject to two criminal, as well as to two civil trials, if the wisdom of legislators think fit. Why should it be so absurd in policy for me, who may have the advantage of a second or a third trial for my estate, in some cases not to have two for my life, which is dearer to me than my estate? Or why is it more absurd in itself, that I should, after condemnation, have a second trial for my life (if it were part of our constitution) than the benefit of the royal pardon, when the sovereign is convinced that I am found guilty and condemned by a partial jury, or false witnesses, or a corrupt judge? And if it is not absurd to have two criminal trials in some cases in the same society, as among us for murder, at the king or queen's suit, and upon appeal[c], it cannot be absurd to be tried and punished twice in different societies, especially so different as the Church and State and their punishments are, and have been taken to be. A man may be disinherited by the father for the same crime, for which the magistrate will also punish him

[b] Ibid., p. 46. [§ 21.]

[c] ["An appeal, in the sense wherein it is here used, (of a criminal prosecution,) means an original suit at the time of its first commencement, by one private subject against another, . . . it is still in force, but very little in use. In the old Gothic constitution . . . if a man made his peace with the king, (was pardoned or acquitted at the king's suit,) still he might be prosecuted at the suit of the party. And so with us, if a man be acquitted on an indictment of murder, or found guilty, and pardoned by the king, still he ought not in strictness to go at large, but be imprisoned or let to bail till the year and day be past, by virtue of the statute 3 Hen. VII. c. 1. in order to be forthcoming to answer any appeal for the same felony."—Blackstone's Commentaries, book iv. c. 23. § 3.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. VIII.

according to law; and the university upon notoriety of fact, or otherwise upon proof, may expel a member, or any number of members, for the same crimes, for which afterwards they may be fined, imprisoned, pilloried, or put to death. I hope therefore what a father of a family hath power to do without absurdity, will not be an absurd power in the father of the Church; or that there is any more injustice in the highest censure of the university, than in that of the Church, which in this case so much resemble one another. And then, as for being punished twice for the same crime, there is neither absurdity nor injustice in that; for a man may be condemned to stand in the pillory, and whipped, at London and at York; and as to the criminal, I desire to know, what is the difference betwixt being punished twice by virtue of one, or two trials; I believe our author, were it his own case, would not think it much.

SECT. IX.

On the power of ordination and deprivation.

He reasons as much after his own manner in arguing[d], that 'if a magistrate may put a bishop to death, he may deprive him, because that includes this.' If this be true, then he may deprive a father of his fatherhood, and dissolve his *jura sanguinis*, and absolutely and for ever discharge his children from their natural duty of obedience, because he can put him to death; or, without excepting the case of adultery, absolutely discharge a husband of his relation to his wife, founded by Divine institution, and give her in marriage to another man. Nay, if this fallacious and improper way of arguing and speaking were to be admitted, then a pagan magistrate, a Nero, Decius, or Dioclesian, may deprive a bishop, because he may put him to death. Nay, after this manner of arguing, when a highwayman kills a bishop, he deprives him; and then Dr. Sharp and Cardinal Beaton, archbishops of St. Andrews, properly speaking were deprived by their murderers, because, according to our author's way of speaking, 'putting to death includes deprivation.' Thus iron is included in the making of a sword, but did ever any say that because a cutler could make a sword, he could therefore make iron? So loss of memory or sight is included in death, but did ever any say, when he spake properly, that he who killed a man deprived him of his sight and

[d] p. 54. [§ 33.]

memory? For privation or deprivation suppose the existence of the subject, which is said to be deprived, and not the destruction of it, and therefore our author spoke as little logic as law, when he said, 'that the death of a bishop included his deprivation, and that the magistrate might deprive him, because he could put him to death.' Stahlius in his fourth maxim[e], *Quod potest majus, potest etiam minus,* would have taught him better logic; and Bronchorstius on the Rules of Law, better law[f]; for when his way of arguing from the greater included in the less is good in law, it supposes first, with respect to the power judicial, that they should both be of the same cognizance, and belong to the same tribunal; and as to the legislative, it supposes that the less as well as the greater, which in his way of speaking includes it, should be within the sphere of their legislation, and not exempted from it by the laws of nature, or the positive laws of God. For the legislation of the magistrate is limited by the laws of God, and the primary laws of nature in the soul of man, and when his laws and institutions are contrary to them, they are void from the beginning; and therefore if the magistrate have not power to deprive bishops, as many learned men think, and as the ancient Christians believed, upon that supposition it will not follow, that though the magistrate may put a bishop to death, that therefore he can deprive him.

DEPRIVATION, &c.

The ancient Christians, though they believed the magistrate could put their bishops to natural or civil death, yet they did not believe they had power to deprive them, and therefore when their bishops were damned to the quarries, and were thereby made *servi pœnæ*[g], very slaves to punishment, they still adhered to them[h], though they were the worst

[e] [It is the fifth maxim. Tit. ii. De regulis actus et potentiæ. Regula V. of the work called Axiomata Philosophica sub titulis xxii. comprehensa; a M. Daniele Stahlio, p. 40. Lond. 1658.]

[f] [Everardi Bronchorstii I. C. in titulum digestorum de diversis regulis juris antiqui enarrationes] ad L. xxi. [Ulpian., lib. 27. ad Sabinum] Non debet, cui plus licet, quod minus est, non licere. [p. 50. Lugd. Bat. 1674.]

[g] [This is a term of the Roman law. Servi pœnæ fiunt qui metallo vel operi addicuntur, vel qua alia pœna damnantur, quæ ministerium corporisque laborem et servitutem irrogat, veluti qui in metallicorum ministerium, ad ludum, ad bestias, in opus publicum damnantur. (See Inst., lib. i. tit. 12. § 3.)—Brissonius de verborum quæ ad jus pertinent significatione, fol. 594. Paris. 1596.]

[h] [See S. Cyprian, Ep. lxxvii. (lxxvi. ed. Oxon.) ad Nemesianum, et cæteros martyras in metallis constitutos, Op., p. 159.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. IX.

of slaves, and had no head in law[l]: and when St. Chrysostom was deprived[k] and banished by the emperor, not only a great part of his own flock, though great sufferers for so doing, but far the greatest part of Christendom adhered to him, as if he had never been deprived. They saw not the consequence from putting to death to deprivation, because they believed that this belonged as much by God's appointment to the spiritual or ecclesiastical, as the other did to the temporal power, and that as bishops were taken into the sacerdotal college, and made fellows of it by bishops, so none but their colleagues, who took them in, could lawfully turn them out. As for learned men who are as much for the magistrate's power, and upon much better principles, than our author, many such have been and are of opinion, that deprivation of bishops doth not belong to the civil power. I shall name but one, viz., Dr. Du Pin, in his *Præloquium* to his seventh dissertation, *De Antiqua Ecclesiæ disciplina*, which I have put in the Appendix[l], because it was written against the papal usurpations over princes, and in behalf of the State against the claims and practices of his own Church. There, after a short but clear discourse of the difference between the ecclesiastical and civil power, he concludes, 'that neither kings nor emperors can make or depose bishops, nor bishops make or depose them.' I have said all this only to shew the inconsequence of our author's argument for deprivation of bishops, in asserting that the magistrate may deprive them, because he can put them to death. What I have said also sheweth his other fallacies in the pursuit of this argument, as where he saith[m], that "to affirm, as non-jurors do, that the magistrate cannot deprive a bishop, but by taking away his life, is to say he cannot remove some part of the punishment which he might justly inflict, without remitting the whole." It is certain, death puts an end to the relation betwixt the bishop and his flock, because it destroys him who is the correlate to them; but it doth not follow from thence, that the

[l] [Servus nullum caput habet, ut ait Justinianus (Inst., lib. i. tit. xvi. § 4.) id est, nullum jus, statumque.—Brissonius ibid., in verbum 'caput.' fol. 65.]

[k] [See Sozom., Eccl. Hist., lib. viii. c. 20—26. St. Chrysostom was deprived by bishops, acting under the influence of the emperor, but their sentence was not allowed by the Church.]

[l] Appendix, No. 5.

[m] Rights, p. 54. [§ 34.]

magistrate hath any authority to deprive him, any more than to excommunicate him, or turn him out of the Church, into which he can take nobody in. This supposes that deprivation of bishops is a punishment belonging to the civil magistrate, which is the question; and he argues as if a Roman of old had said, to affirm that a president of a province cannot banish a man, but by banishing him out of life, is to say he cannot exact part of the punishment without remitting the whole; for a president of a province, though he had a power of life and death, he had no power of deportation by the Roman constitution[n]; and as the subordinate magistrate is to the supreme, so the supreme is to God; he can inflict no punishments but such as God hath given him power to inflict. He saith farther[o], that "it is not by death only that the magistrate can deprive a bishop, but by perpetual imprisonment or banishment, with a prohibition to his subjects of corresponding with him:" to which I say again, this is still supposing what he ought to prove, that perpetual banishment or imprisonment with such a prohibition, doth dissolve the relation between the bishop and his flock. It would not dissolve the relation between a father and his children, or between a husband and his wife; and he knows that those of the other opinion think the same of the relation of the bishop to his flock. They are of opinion, whether right or wrong I shall not here determine, that perpetual banishment or imprisonment can no more deprive a bishop, than perpetual captivity; but that as long as he lives undeprived by the spiritual power, his relation will continue to his flock. DEPRIVATION, &c.

And in the same loose manner that he argues against the power of excommunication, he also disputes[p] against the power of ordination, as 'inconsistent with the magistrate's right to protect the commonwealth.' And why forsooth? "because then the bishops may put not only men of the best abilities to serve the commonwealth, but such great numbers

[n] [Deportatio was the form of banishment introduced by Augustus in place of the aquæ et ignis interdictio. The power of inflicting it was in the emperor, by whom it was conceded only to the Præfectus Urbis. Præsidem deportare non posse, nulla dubitatio est. Ulpian, Dig., lib. xlviii. tit. xix. sect. 2. § 1. deportandi in insulam jus præsidibus provinciæ non est datum. Ibid., tit. xxii. sect. 5. § 7. of their power of life and death. Ibid., tit. xix. sect. 8. § 1. See Bronchorst, (ubi supr. note f. p. 175.) Præses provinciæ, qui jus habet.. gladii, deportare in insulam tamen non potest.]

[o] Rights, p. 55. [§ 34.]

[p] Ibid., p. 47. [§ 23.]

into orders, the better to carry on their common interest, (which we see actually done in popish countries,) as may tend to the infinite prejudice of the state." Here is the same fallacy again of arguing against just power from the supposed abuse of it; and were there any sense in it, it would be good against all power, but that of God and good angels, which cannot be perverted or abused. At this absurd rate may men argue against the legislative or supreme executive power in all countries, and particularly in our own. The independent power of our parliaments, may a man say, to give away our money, is inconsistent with the rights of the people, because then they may give away all we have, and make us as poor, and slaves as much as in other countries. The independent power of our kings and queens, may another say, to make war, is inconsistent with the happiness of the kingdom, because they may make war a hundred years together, and thereby utterly waste both the treasure and people of the land. The independent power of our kings and queens to make peers, only whom, and when they please, another may say, is inconsistent with our constitution, because by refusing to make peers for two or three long reigns together, they may extinguish the peerage, as in Denmark[q], and with it one of the three estates; or reduce the peers to such a small number, as will not make a house. Nay this formidable way of disputing against the power of the clergy in behalf of the magistrate, had it any force in it, would be as valid for the clergy against the independent power of the magistrate, as it is for the magistrate against that of the clergy. The independent power of our kings and queens, may an Englishman say, to nominate and choose bishops, is inconsistent not only with the well-being, but the being, of the Church, because they may nominate not only the most illiterate and immoral men for bishops, but choose whether they will nominate any at all, and so in twenty or thirty years destroy not only one of the three estates, but the true Church of God among us. Nay, at this idle rate of arguing, especially in

[q] [In 1660, by a movement of the unprivileged classes, the king was made absolute, and the privileges of the nobles taken away. They lost all influence and rapidly declined in number and position.—See Lord Molesworth's account of Denmark, published in 1694, c. vii. and the Universal History, vol. xxviii. pp. 359, 360. 1782.]

his beloved way of speaking, a man may say, the power which the parliament assumes to itself of depriving bishops and priests, is against the fundamental rights and liberties of the Church, because then they may deprive not only men of the best abilities to serve her, but such great numbers, as may tend to her infinite prejudice; and how can we be certain they may not deprive all. DEPRIVATION, &c.

Such is our author's way of writing in quirks and sophisms through his whole book, as I could make it appear, had I room and time to go through it all. In this manner he argues in several places, as invidiously as he can, against 'the obligation, the clergy say the magistrate hath, to protect the Church, and assist them in doing their duty, and putting their decrees in execution.' This he saith[r], makes the magistrate "their deputy, or rather their executioner;" and that 'this obligation of executing their decrees supposes they have a right to command it, and that the magistrate, as well as the laity, is only their executioner, being obliged, right or wrong, to enforce their commands.' To which I answer, here is a slander, and more than one fallacy. First, here is couched a foul slander upon the clergy, as if they asserted, that the magistrate was bound to protect them in evil, as much as in well-doing, and to assist them with the secular arm in wrong, as well as right, and in executing unrighteous, as well as righteous decrees. Secondly, here are several fallacies; as first, in saying this obligation of the magistrate to help and assist the governors of the Church to execute their decrees and censures, gives them a power to command it, because they have a right to ask it, and to ask it when it is necessary with prayers and tears, and to ask it in God's name and for His sake; as one part of a family may humbly and earnestly ask the protection and assistance of the father and master, against the insolence and injuries of the other, and to protect them in doing their duty; and when this happened, would it not be a fine speech in the delinquents to say to him, 'Sir, these insolent fellows only complain to you, to shew the power they think they have to command you, and to make you their servant and executioner.' Or to bring the comparison a little nearer to the case of two independent

[r] Rights, pp. 56, 57. [§ 36, 37.]

societies in one place, as of the universities and cities of Oxford and Cambridge; let us suppose, that a certain number of scholars outraged by townsmen, should complain of them in either place to the mayor, or a certain number of townsmen outraged by scholars, should prefer their complaints to the vice-chancellor, would it be a good and reasonable answer in either of those magistrates to say, 'get ye gone you insolent fellows, do you think you have a right to command me, and that I will be your executioner?' To conclude, this way of false reasoning, were it true, would make the clergy as much the magistrate's deputy and executioner, as the magistrate the clergy's. As for example, if in a notorious flagrant sedition or rebellion, the magistrate (for I still use his own term) should convene the clergy in convocation, and desire or require the aid of their censures against the Corahs and Dathans of such a sedition or rebellion, they might by his logic, instead of assisting the magistrate according to their duty, return him this answer, 'what, doth he suppose he hath a right to command us? we will be none of his deputies or executioners.' The vanity of this argument might also be shewn by application of it to two independent kingdoms or states, the sovereigns of which are bound by the laws of nations, upon notification, not to protect or assist one another's rebels, but to drive them out of their dominions, or deliver them up, that is, in his scurrilous expression, 'to be one another's executioners;' but I hope I have said enough to detect the folly and malice of this way of reasoning, in which our author delights so much. For he uses[s] the same argument against the clergy, to prove that "if their power were judicial, they might save, or damn, as they think fit, and that God is bound to execute their sentences, though they condemn a good, and absolve an ill man; because a sentence pronounced by a competent authority is valid, though it is not right; and consequently on this supposition men ought to pay Divine worship to these judges, rather than to God Himself, since the power of saving and damning is in them, and God Himself is no more than their executioner."

According to this silly way of reasoning he may say, first, that all criminal judges may save, or damn, as they think fit,

[s] p. 68. [chap. ii. § 5.]

though in all countries they are sworn to the best of their understandings to administer true judgment. Secondly, that though they condemn an innocent, and acquit a guilty man, be it by pure error or corruption, the sovereign is bound to execute their sentences, that is, to let them be executed, be they right, or wrong. Thirdly, that it is no matter how the people live, could they be acquitted by these judges, 'to whom men ought to pay more honour, than to the sovereign himself, since the power of condemning and saving is in them, and the sovereign is no more than their executioner.' As many falsities, and fallacies, as there are in this case, so many there are in what he hath said against the judicial power of Church governors, who judge for, and under God in spirituals, as the twelve judges of this kingdom judge in temporals for, and under our kings and queens, who are bound in conscience, and I think by oath[t], to shew mercy, in the cases of corrupt verdicts and erroneous judgments; and so, when the same case happens in ecclesiastical censures, the great and righteous Judge will of His infinite mercy do; as the Catholic Church hath always taught[u].

DEPRIVATION, &c.

The folly and blasphemy of his Horeb contract[x] hath been

[t] [Hickes seems to allude to the second article of the coronation oath. "Will you to your power cause law and justice, in mercy, to be executed in your dominions? I will."]

[u] Cyprian. in Epist. ad Antonianum. [Ep. lii.] Neque enim præjudicamus Domino judicaturo, quo minus si pœnitentiam plenam et justam peccatoris invenerit, tunc ratum faciat quod a nobis fuerit hic statutum. Si vero nos aliquis pœnitentiæ simulatione deluserit, Deus qui non deridetur, et qui cor hominis intuetur, de his quæ nos minus perspeximus judicet, et servorum suorum sententiam Dominus emendet. [p. 71. ed. Ben.] Et quia [apud inferos confessio non est,] nec exomologesis illic fieri potest; qui ex toto corde pœnituerint, et rogaverint, in Ecclesiam debent interius suscipi, et in ipsa Domino reservari, qui ad Ecclesiam suam venturus de illis utique quos in ea intus invenerit, judicabit. [Ibid., p. 75.] So in the Epistle of the African bishops to Cornelius, p. 118. [ed. Oxon.] Si autem, quod Dominus avertat a fratribus nostris, aliquis lapsorum fefellerit, ut pacem subdole petat, ... seipsum fallit et decipit; qui aliud corde occultat, et aliud voce pronunciat. Nos, in quantum nobis et videre et judicare conceditur, faciem singulorum videmus: cor scrutari, et mentem perspicere non possumus. De his judicat occultorum scrutator, et cognitor cito venturus, et de arcanis cordis, atque abditis judicaturus. [S. Cypr., Op., Ep. liv. p. 78. ed. Ben. "See also Cypr. de lapsis, edit. Oxon. pp. 128, 129." (p. 186. ed. Ben.) Supp. 1715. No. 9. p. 9.]

[x] [See Rights, Introduction, p. 9. and also, "the Jews, when they came out of the land of bondage, were under no settled government till God was pleased to offer Himself to be their king, to which all the people expressly consented (Exod. xix.); and upon the covenant's being ratified after the most solemn manner which could be, (Deut. v.) God gave them those laws which bound no nation except those that had agreed to the Horeb contract."—Ibid., c. iv. p. 151.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. IX.

clearly and convincingly set forth in the Rehearsal[y], and that being one of the pillars of his work, the superstructure of his book is utterly ruined with it, and therefore I shall take no farther notice of it. In his introduction[z], which is as it were the ground-work of the whole book, he supposes there was an antecedent "state of nature" in which men lived before political government was erected, though this wild notion hath been so many times unanswerably confuted by the writers against Hobbes, and of late by the Rehearsal against Mr. Locke[a]. There also he hath confounded the laws and rights of nature, miscalling the latter by the name of the former, though this sophism, which affects the whole

[y] [The following are extracts from the Rehearsal. No. 172, Jan. 8, 1706. "This book of the Rights places the authority and right of dominion which God had over the Jews, in the original right they had to choose a king for themselves, whom they pleased, or to have had none, as they pleased. 'Tis true he makes God offer Himself to them as a candidate in the election for the crown, and that the choice of the people fell upon Him, which made Him their king. . . . He says it [the election] was made at Horeb when the law was given, which therefore he calls the Horeb contract."

But in answer Leslie argues, "If it was their authority which made Him their king, then they had authority to call Him to an account, and to depose Him."

Again, "It seems God took upon Him to be their king, and gave them laws, (the circumcision, the passover, &c.) without staying for the grace of their election."

Again, No. 173, Jan. 11, 1706. "He was their king before, and the people did own Him as such always, and He gave them laws and punished them for the breach of them, before He appeared to them at Horeb, so that could not be the original contract."

And No. 174, Jan. 15. "This fancied Horeb contract made no alteration at all in their government. It remained just as it was before, and the end of that glorious and terrible appearance at Horeb was . . . to confirm that government which God had already placed them under, that they might the more fear God and His servant Moses.

"There were many miraculous interpositions before that time, not only of wonders wrought, but as to the settlement of the government both in Church and State. The supreme civil government having been given to Moses, by the special command of God, not through any intervention or so much as recommendation of the people."

No. 175, Jan. 18, 1706. "As to the people they are obliged to consent to whatever God commands them. If they will not consent they are rebels, and under His displeasure."]

[z] [Rights, Introduction, § 4, sqq. pp. 3, &c.]

[a] [See the Rehearsal, No. 55. Aug. 11, to Aug. 18, 1705. "Government is dependency, when one depends upon another. It is superiority, when one is superior and another inferior. Therefore they who would have the original of governments in the people are obliged to suppose a state of independency among all mankind, when no man in the world had any dependence on any other man, and when no man was superior to another. This they call the state of nature. And if such a state cannot be shewed their whole scheme falls to the ground. But they happened ill to call this the state of nature, among a race of mankind who came into the world by generation. . . . Therefore this supposed independent state of mankind must be looked for among the Præadamites. Or we must suppose a shower of men dropping out of the clouds, without fathers or mothers, all upon the level. Or, that men were created in multitudes like the beasts, birds, fish, and fowl." The argument is continued in the following Nos. See note p, p. 203, and note r, p. 204.

DEPRIVATION, &c.

discourse, hath been long since excellently solved by the bishop of Sarum, in his Vindication of the Authority, Constitution, and Laws of the Church and State of Scotland[b], where his lordship distinguishes, like a learned casuist and civilian, between them; and there in a few pages, cited in the margin, our author may see his whole scheme, and all he hath erected upon it, overturned.

SECT. X. Of Church revenues.

What he hath said against annexing preferments to religion, or settling revenues upon the clergy, or, as he hath a talent for invidious expressions, "of tacking the priests' preferments to such opinions[c]," is a downright impeachment of the Divine wisdom, who annexed such large profits, and revenues in cities, lands, tithes, offerings, and other privileges upon the Jewish priesthood; of which Philo[d] the Jew makes this observation: "That as to revenues, the law made the priests equal in honour and veneration to kings, which commanded the people to bring their tributes to them from all quarters, but in a different manner," saith he, "from that in which people pay tribute to kings, which they pay with compulsion and complaints, hating the gatherers of their taxes as public pests, and finding pretences not to pay them at the appointed times. But they never failed to pay the priests' dues, with such willingness and joy, without being asked, as if they rather were the receivers than givers; men and women

[b] pp. 7—12. [The full title of this work is "a Vindication of the Authority, Constitution, and Laws of the Church and State of Scotland, in four conferences, by Gilbert Burnet, Professor of Theology in Glasgow." Glasgow, 1673. The passage referred to is, "To examine what you have said you must distinguish well betwixt the laws of nature and the rights or permissions of nature: the first are unalterable obligations, by which all men are bound, which can be reversed by no positive law, and transgressed by no person upon no occasion. . . . Now self-defence cannot be a law of nature, otherwise it could never be dispensed with without a sin; nay were a man never so criminal. Forcible self-defence cannot be a law of nature, but only a right; otherwise we could not thus dispense with it."—p. 8.]

[c] Rights, Introduction, pp. 17, 22, 23, 25.

[d] [*ἐξ ὧν ἁπάντων ἐστὶ δῆλον, ὁτὶ βασιλέων σεμνότητα καὶ τιμὴν περιάπτει τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ὁ νόμος· ὡς γοῦν ἡγέμοσι φόρους ἀπὸ παντὸς μέρους κτήσεως δίδοσθαι κελεύει· καὶ δίδονται τὸν ἐνάντιον τρόπον ἢ ὃν αἱ πόλεις τοῖς δυνάσταις εἰσφέρουσιν· αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ μόλις, ἐπιστένουσαι, τοὺς ἐκλογεῖς τῶν χρημάτων ὡς κοινοὺς λυμεῶνας ὑποβλεπόμεναι, καὶ προφάσεις ἄλλοτε ἀλλοίας σκηπτόμεναι, καὶ τῶν προθεσμιῶν ἀλογοῦσαι, τὰ ὁρισθέντα τέλη καὶ δασμοὺς κατατιθέασιν· οἱ δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους τὰ ἱερατικὰ γεγηθότες, χαίροντες, τοὺς αἰτοῦντας φθάνοντες, τὰς προθεσμίας ἐπιτέμοντες, λαμβάνειν ἀλλ' οὐ διδόναι νομίζοντες, μετ' εὐφημίας καὶ εὐχαριστίας καθ' ἑκάστην τῶν ἐτησίων ὥρων ποιοῦντες τὰς εἰσφοράς, ἄνδρες ὁμοῦ καὶ γυναῖκες, αὐτοκελεύστῳ προθυμίᾳ καὶ ἑτοιμότητι καὶ σπουδῇ παντὸς λόγου κρείττονι.*—Philo Jud. de Præmiis Sacerdotum, Op., tom. ii. p. 234.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. X.

at the set anniversary times bringing their tithes and offerings with such good presages, gratulations, and alacrity, as cannot be expressed."

I wish he were as fit and worthy to read this tract, as it is worthy to be read by him and others; but no reading, no authority will make impressions upon men who envy priests their revenues, and write against them because they would share in the sacrilegious spoil of them, and who have the spite of infernal spirits against the Christian priesthood and Church. He saith[e], "hereafter" he will "fully prove," that in the first ages "they subsisted by the alms of the people, and were in all other matters wholly dependent on them in their choice, as well as their alms." This and many other things we are to expect against the clergy from this formidable hereafter-book[f]. Well, *che venga*, let it come; I hope the clergy are prepared for it; it will be *morientis bestiæ ultimus morsus*, the last hiss, I trust, of the old serpent, and then he will have done his worst. The Christians of old were but one society, one sect, which had one Faith, one Baptism for the remission of sins; one Lord Jesus, through whom they worshipped the one God; one visible head, or principle of unity in every Church, under the invisible Bishop of their souls, and High-Priest of their profession, the same Lord Jesus; one Catholic Communion in all places of the earth; one Priesthood, and one representative Sacrifice of memorial, the bond of unity and peace in that one Communion. This, I hope, I have shewed in the following letters; but these men's new scheme of religion[g], if we may believe their speaker in his book of the Rights, is destructive of Christianity, as one society and one sect: for all the principles of religion that they are pleased to own is only the "being of a God[h] and His providence," which he saith whosoever denies, "may not only be justly punished by the magistrate, but also by every one in the state of nature," upon supposition of which imaginary state nothing can be more absurd. But then as to the worship of God he saith[i], "All men are free to wor-

SECT. XI.

The new scheme.

[e] Rights, c. vi. § 37. p. 219.

[f] [This second part, frequently promised in the Rights, (see above, end of note, p. 80,) was never published. The second volume of the edition of 1709 consists of defences of the first.]

[g] Rights, Introduction, § 16—20. pp. 11—15.

[h] Ibid., p. 12.

[i] Ibid., pp. 14, 15.

THE NEW SCHEME.

ship Him according to their consciences, and after the manner they think most agreeable to His will, and to profess such speculative matters as they think true, that do another man no injury; . . . . . because in these matters men are still in a state of nature, subject to God and their own consciences, without any sovereign to determine what they shall believe or profess," and "that the magistrate is bound to protect men in the way they choose of worshipping God, as in other indifferent matters[j]." So that men, but why do I say men? for Christians, if they like it, are now free to worship God after the patriarchal, Jewish, or Mahometan manner, or any other way which may be devised of worshipping of Him, without Christ as well as with Him, altogether as well in a synagogue, or mosque, as in a Christian church; nay, they may if they please, worship God and particularly administer the Eucharist, after the impure Gnostical manner, (which I am ashamed to mention,) according to his wild scheme, which is erected on many absurdities and presumptions, as that "the magistrate[k] hath no power about indifferent things; that men may form themselves into what companies, clubs, and meetings they please, which the magistrate" (he means the supreme magistrate), "as long as the public sustains no damage, cannot hinder without manifest injustice, and acting contrary to the end for which he is entrusted." Where he supposes what he should prove, that the people, and not the magistrate, is judge of public good and hurt, and that he is their trustee. It also involves a manifest contradiction; because if men, as to speculative matters of belief, are still in a state of natural freedom to believe and follow the dictates of their own consciences, then the atheist, who cannot believe the being and providence of God, ought to be free as to his conscience: for whether there is a God, and whether or no He minds human affairs, is a "speculative[l]" point, and by consequence, he that after "impartial examination[m]" cannot believe there is a God and providence, but thinks that belief false and superstitious, and that it is hurtful to mankind to possess them with such slavish fears, ought to have his natural freedom, and not to be

[j] [Rights, p. 16.]
[k] Ibid., p. 15.
[l] Ibid., p. 8.
[m] Ibid., p. 16.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XI.

punished and persecuted for his belief. For were Epicurus, Democritus, Diagoras, Protagoras, Lucretius, Lucian or Vaninus alive, they would retort upon our author, and tell him he was a creed-maker, and that it was precarious to say, that not believing an 'invisible power, and His concerning Himself with human affairs, was injurious to human society[n];' that on the contrary, it was injurious to men to have the belief of such a superstitious opinion imposed upon them, because it made them their own slaves, and tormented their minds day and night with needless terrors; and that whom the rods, and axes, and jails, and deportation, and servitude, would not terrify from violating their duties to the public, neither, as experience shewed, would the fear of an invisible power restrain. They would tell him in his own language[o], 'that the magistrate's power could not reach their consciences, nor could they invest him with such a power against the dictates of their own understandings, which they had a natural right to follow,' and that he who would teach men such slavish doctrines, much more he that would impose the belief of them upon them, was as great "an enemy to the whole race of mankind[p]," as he that sent them to the galleys, because the slavery of the mind was much greater, and more ignoble, and unworthy the nature of man, who is a free thinker, than that of the body, and that 'they could not authorize the sovereign to extend his power so far[q].'

He cannot but know that there are great numbers of unbelievers among us, who can argue in this manner against him, better than I can for them, and who will tell him the creed he would impose on them and all mankind is larger than he represents it to be; for he that truly believes the being of a God, must believe that He is absolute in perfection, and the first cause of all other beings; and he who believes that "God concerns Himself in the affairs of mankind[r]," must also believe that He is to be worshipped, and that He will judge all men after death, because He lets wicked men oppress and prosper, and good men be oppressed and persecuted in this life, and then impartially reward and punish

[n] [Rights, p. 13.]
[o] Ibid., p. 23. [§ 28.]
[p] Ibid., p. 12.
[q] Ibid., p. 27. ["If sovereigns did not endeavour to extend their power further than their people could authorize them."]
[r] [Ibid., p. 12.]

them according to their works. Here then follows the creed, which he would have all men own, or be punished by every man, in a state of nature, and by the magistrate, in every government, as an enemy to the whole race of mankind: "I believe in one God, the first cause of all things, who is infinite in power, wisdom, goodness, and presence; who is to be worshipped by men, whose providential care extends itself to all mankind; and I believe that there is another life after this, in which He will bring all men to judgment, and without respect of persons, reward the good, and punish the wicked according to their works." He would impose this creed upon men of as bright understandings, and of as 'free and large thoughts' as himself, under most severe penalties, and, in his own language, make not only the magistrate, but the people of every government, "to be his deputies and executioners:" and the reasons which he gives (let me use his own words) for persecuting unbelievers, are such as they will tell him are precarious, and need proof, and such as may be retorted upon himself. First they will tell him it is precarious to say, that "denying the being of a God, or His providence, is an injury to civil societies," because believers of both do as much mischief to human societies as those who believe neither; and that Tyburn for instance, as one of them has observed, keeps the world among us in better order than the fear of an invisible power, by which priests of all religions have alike enslaved mankind. They will ask him a thousand cramp questions, to refute this pretended reason; as for example, they will ask him if there is one atheist among a thousand, or ten thousand drunkards, or swearers, or fornicators, or thieves, or murderers? They will ask him whether at public executions criminals do not always profess or shew some religion? and whether in all rebellions the rebels do not pretend most to religion of all other men? and whether reformation of religion, or the preservation of it, hath not a thousand times been the pretence of taking up arms, and of murdering and deposing princes? and whether there are not as many robberies, and rapes, and treasons, and murders, and cheats, even in Christian countries, who pretend most to religion, as in the most ignorant and barbarous, who have least. They would ask him, if Epicurus did not live as well

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XI.

as Socrates? and if they did not live full as well as himself, who presumed to make a creed for them? and withal would tell him, that if they could see with his eyes, and understand with his understanding, and believe as he pretends to believe, "the being of a God and providence," they would live up to the height of those principles, in much better lives than they see him, or most pretended believers do. They would also tell him, that no man is or can be "under an indispensable obligation to worship God," but he that believes there is one; and that they, no more than other men, "can make over their right of judging for themselves[s]," or ought to have their understandings "at another man's disposal;" and that there is no more reason to persecute them for not being deists, than deists for not being Christians, or Christians of one Church or communion for not being of another. If men's understandings (would they tell him) ought to be free in one sect, they ought to be free in all. If others must follow their own dictates, why not we? If he who believes the being of a God, and His providence, must have liberty to worship Him after the manner he thinks most agreeable to Him, why must not we, who cannot believe one or both those articles, have the liberty not to worship at all? Why must we, of all men, be made hypocrites? Indulgence is indulgence (will they say), and toleration is toleration, and liberty is liberty, and creeds are creeds, and persecution is persecution alike among all sorts and sects of men; and therefore, according to the proverb, let the magistrate, who should be impartial, 'save all or hang all,' loose all or bind all. We desire the common freedom of judging for ourselves; and we do not find, but that we have as good understandings, and can reason as well as other men; we are as good physicians, as good lawyers, as good politicians, as good naturalists and mathematicians as others, be they deists, Jews, or Christians; and why we should not be as good philosophers, and as good judges in the dispute about religion, whether there ought to be any or none, we declare we cannot understand.

SECT. XII. The distinction of

He hath promised the world, and thereby threatened the clergy, to "treat[t] of the method the first Christian emperors

[s] Rights, p. 14.

[t] Ibid., p. 27.

CHURCH DISTINCT. the empire and the Church stated.

should have taken to prevent ecclesiastical tyranny and priestcraft;" of which I say again, *che venga*, let it come. I suppose the Arian emperor Constantius, son of Constantine the Great, will be set forth by him as a great example how his father should have treated the clergy to prevent priestcraft. For he, like a wise prince, sent[u] out summons to the Catholic bishops of the empire to appear at his palace before him, and when they came, he commanded them to subscribe to his banishment of Athanasius, and to communicate with the Arians[v]. But the western bishops, "wondering at his enterprise[x], as a new thing, told him that was not a proceeding according to ecclesiastical canons. To which he presently replied, *ἀλλ' ὅπερ ἐγὼ βούλομαι*, but what I command, that shall be a canon, and do you obey me, as the pretended bishops of Syria have done, or I will send you into banishment. At which the bishops still wondering more, and lifting up their hands to heaven, spoke with great boldness unto him, telling him, that the empire he had got was not from himself, but from God who gave it to him, and that it was to be feared He would suddenly take it away from him; and threatened him with the day of judgment, persuading him, that he should not destroy the way of proceeding in ecclesiastical matters, neither confound the jurisdiction of the Roman empire with the authority of the Church. But he would not hear them, or suffer them to speak any more; but threatening them, he drew his sword at them, and commanded some of them to be carried into banishment, though

[u] Athanas. in Epist. ad solitariam vitam agentes. Edit. Paris. 1627. pp. 829—831. [Historia Arianorum ad Monachos, § 32. Op., tom. i. p. 362, C.]

[v] Paulinus of Treves, Lucifer of Caralis, Eusebius of Vercelli, Dionysius of Milan. [Ibid., § 33. p. 363, D.]

[x] [*τούτους γὰρ βασιλεὺς καλέσας ἐκέλευσε κατὰ Ἀθανασίου μὲν ὑπογράφειν, τοῖς δὲ αἱρετικοῖς κοινωνεῖν· εἶτα ἐκείνων θαυμαζόντων τὸ καινὸν ἐπιτήδευμα τοῦτο, καὶ λεγόντων, μὴ εἶναι τοῦτον ἐκκλησιάστικον κανόνα, εὐθὺς ἐκεῖνος, ἀλλ' ὅπερ ἐγὼ βούλομαι τοῦτο κανών, ἔλεγε, νομιζέσθω· οὕτω γάρ μου λέγοντος ἀνέχονται οἱ τῆς Συρίας λεγόμενοι ἐπίσκοποι· ἢ τοίνυν πείσθητε, ἢ καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑπερόριοι γενήσεσθε. ταῦτα ἀκούσαντες οἱ ἐπίσκοποι, πανύγε θαυμάσαντες καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἀνατείναντες πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, πολλῇ τῇ κατ' αὐτοῦ παρρησίᾳ μετὰ λόγων ἐχρήσαντο, διδάσκοντες μὴ εἶναι τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ τοῦ δεδωκότος Θεοῦ, ὃν καὶ φοβεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἠξίουν μὴ ἐξαίφνης αὐτὴν ἀφέληται· ἠπείλουν τε τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς κρίσεως, καὶ συνεβούλευον αὐτῷ μὴ διαφθείρειν τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ μηδὲ ἐγκαταμίσγειν τὴν Ρωμαικὴν ἀρχὴν τῇ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διαταγῇ, μήδε τὴν Ἀρειανὴν αἵρεσιν εἰσάγειν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἀλλ' οὔτε ἤκουεν ἐκεῖνος, οὔτε τι πλέον αὐτοῖς λέγειν ἐπέτρεπεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μᾶλλον ἠπείλει, καὶ ξίφος ἐγύμνου κατ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀπάγεσθαι δέ τινας ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐκέλευσε, καὶ πάλιν, ὡς ὁ Φαραὼ, μετεγίνωσκεν.—* Ibid., § 34. p. 364.]

afterwards, like Pharaoh, he revoked his sentence." I hope he will also tell us what Moses should have done to prevent ecclesiastical tyranny and priestcraft among the Jews, and what method Christ and His Apostles should at first have taken to prevent it among Christians; and it will be temper and moderation in him, if he do not reproach them all for dividing the priesthood from the magistracy, and tearing the ecclesiastical from the civil power, which at first were united in the patriarchal Churches, for many ages before and after the flood.

This distinction between the empire and the Church, and betwixt the imperial and ecclesiastical authority, which the bishops, as confessors, asserted to the threatening emperor's face, was owned by his father Constantine the Great, and after him by Theodosius the Great, Valentinian, Marcian, and Justinian the Great, as I have shewed in the second letter[y]; and as the distinction of clergy and laity is as old as the time of the Apostles, so this between the two powers is as old as the union of the Church and empire, and was ever admitted and received over all Christendom (even by Henry VIII. himself[z]) for more than fifteen hundred years. What was the sense Basilius the emperor had of these two authorities, to the latter end of the ninth century, may be seen from these words[a]: "It in no wise belongs to a layman to meddle with ecclesiastical causes, nor to resist the whole Church, and an œcumenical council; for the cognizance and discussion of such matters belongs to patriarchs, bishops, and priests, to whom God hath given the power of loosing and binding. For a layman, though never so venerable and wise, is but a layman, a sheep, and not the shepherd; and a bishop, though never so unworthy of reverence, is still the shepherd,

[y] [The Dignity of the Episcopal Order, chap. i. sect. 3—5.]

[z] [Ibid., sect. 6.]

[a] Beveregii Συνόδικον, tom. ii. [annotationes] pp. 109, 110. [in Can. iii. Conc. Chalced. p. 109, of the conduct of Marcian; p. 110, of Basilius, "qui coram octava generali synodo Constantinopoli habitâ, (A.D. 869, 870.) hæc diserte dixit. . . . λαικῷ δὲ οἱῳδήποτε κατ' οὐδενα τρόπον ἐξεῖναι λέγω περὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ὑποθέσεων λόγον ἀνακινεῖν, ἢ ἀνθίστασθαι ὁλοκλήρῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἢ οἰκουμενικῇ συνόδῳ· ταῦτα γὰρ ἀνιχνέυειν τε καὶ ζητεῖν πατριαρχῶν ἔργον ἐστὶ, καὶ ἱερέων, καὶ διδασκάλων, οἷς τὸ λύειν τε καὶ δεσμεῖν δέδοται ἐκ Θεοῦ· ὁ γὰρ λαικὸς, κἂν πάσης ἐστὶν εὐλαβείας καὶ σοφίας μεστὸς, ἀλλὰ λαικὸς, καὶ πρόβατον, οὐ ποιμήν· ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς κἂν πᾶσαν ἐπιδείκνυται ἀνευλάβειαν, ἀλλὰ ποιμήν ἐστι, ἐστ' ἂν ἐν ἀρχιερεῦσι τελῇ· καὶ οὐ χρὴ κατεξανίστασθαι τῶν ποιμένων τὰ πρόβατα.—et apud Concil., tom. x. p. 881, E.]

CHURCH DISTINCT.

and retains the authority of a bishop, and the sheep ought not to rise against the shepherd."

SECT. XIII.

The independency of the Church and empire.

This distinction of the ecclesiastical and imperial authority, and of the societies to which they belonged, and the independency of one upon the other was plain to all Christians in former ages, and may be so still to any that will without prejudice and partiality consider a few things. As first, the difference of their originals; the ecclesiastical authority having been given by God to Christ, and by Christ immediately to His Apostles, as is evident from Matt. xxviii. 18—20, and from the history of the Acts of the Apostles, who by virtue of their commission, did all things contrary not only to the commands of their own magistrates in Jerusalem, but to the "decrees of Cæsar" all over the empire; for which they were called "pestilent fellows, and movers of sedition;" and without a Divine commission to act as they did, they had been indeed the most pestilent and seditious fellows that ever were in the world. "Go ye therefore (said our Lord) and teach all nations," and "take heed to yourselves (saith St. Paul to the elders assembled at Miletus) and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to feed the Church of God which He hath purchased with His blood." Here is a spiritual power set up in the Apostles against the civil powers of the Jewish and Gentile world; a power in the name of King Jesus, to preach down the Jewish and Gentile religions, to form their proselytes into churches, to make laws for the regulation and preservation of them, and to turn the world upside down. "Two[b]" such "independent supreme powers" there were then in the world[c], "clashing" and "interfering" with one another, by the fault of the secular power, for three hundred years together, even after the credentials of miracles ceased, one commanding to preach up Jesus, another commanding not to preach about Him; and though "God is the God of order and not of confusion," He made the Christians "subject to these two clashing powers, who commanded them not only different, but contrary things at the same time[d]."

[Acts 5. 28, 29.]

[ib. 17. 7.]

[ib. 24. 5.]

[Matt. 28. 18.]

[Acts 20. 28.]

[1 Cor. 14. 33.]

[b] Rights, chap. i. p. 33. ["That there cannot be two independent powers in the same society," is the subject of the first chapter of the Rights; which Hickes here meets by shewing that the Church and State are not the same society.]

[c] Ibid., p. 35.

[d] Ibid.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XIII.

The same persons, as for instance, the many thousands that made up the Church in Jerusalem, had two such heads, the one spiritual, and the other temporal; and if these "two heads make a monster[e]," as he blasphemously speaks, it was a monster of God's making, for the power which He gave to Christ, Christ gave to the Apostles, and they also gave to others, to proselyte the subjects of all civil sovereigns, and form them into societies, whether they would or no. It was then they kept a weekly holy-day[f], I mean the first day of the week, when they were forbidden by the magistrate. It was then they "exercised their spiritual functions in this and that place," when "the civil power commanded them from thence;" it was then "the clergy[g] put men in such posts in the Church, as made it necessary for their spiritual subjects to converse with them," though "the magistrate forbad them to have correspondence with such persons." The same was afterwards done in the reigns of apostate and heretical emperors, and the wisest heads among the Christians then never complained, that these two independent powers were "monstrous" or "absurd," as he asserts again and again, to the great dishonour of God. This pretended absurdity he endeavours to make out by mere fallacies, to deceive unwary readers, as where he says, that the "same man can no more be under different obligations, than at different places[h]," which is true; but then those who are subject to two independent powers, commanding contrary things, can be but under one obligation, as the Apostles said unto their own magistrates at Jerusalem, "We ought to obey God rather than men, and whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you, more than unto Him, judge ye." Such another fallacious way of speaking is that, where he saith, that "there cannot be two independent powers in the same society[i];" this is his beloved phrase, which signifies nothing; for it begs the question by supposing the Church and empire to be one and the same society, which were always held to be different,

[Acts 5. 29; 4. 19.]

[e] Rights, p. 35.

[f] Ibid., [§ 2.] pp. 33, 34. ["One power may command him to keep holy-day upon an ecclesiastical, the other to work upon a civil account: the ecclesiastical power may oblige a person to exercise his function, in this or that place; the civil power (for reasons relating to the state) may command him from thence."]

[g] Ibid., p. 34.

[h] Ibid., chap. i. § 1. p. 33.

[i] Ibid., p. 20, 28, 29, 33, 35, 36, &c.

CHURCH INDEPENDENT.

and independent one of another; and therefore though there cannot be two independent powers in the same society, yet in two such different societies there may be two independent powers, and the same persons may be subjects to both. So the same number of men may be freemen of the cities of London and York, and these two cities may sometimes clash and interfere with one another; but when that happens, they can be but under one obligation, and that is to side with the city they know or believe is in the right. But though the same men may put themselves under two independent powers, yet, by his way of reasoning, it is absurd to say that God can make them so subject. He hath the confidence to say[k], it is a doctrine 'as absurd and impossible on earth, as multiplicity of Gods is in heaven;' and that it is a notion which, "instead of being founded in Christianity, savours most grossly of heathenish divinity." *O tempora! O mores!*

But secondly, this ancient distinction of the ecclesiastical and imperial power, or of the Church from the empire, is evident not only from the difference of their several originals, but from their different extents, the different ways by which men are admitted into them, and their different rights and privileges, which for brevity's sake I shall consider altogether. For the Church is one society, one body all the world over, under one Priesthood, and one Head, Jesus Christ; from whence it comes to pass, that he who is rightly admitted into any one Church, is admitted into all; and he who is rightly turned out of one Church, is turned out of all; and he that hath a right to communion in one Church, hath a right of communion in all. Which is not so in empires, kingdoms, or sovereign states, which make not one, but many different and independent societies, among which, whosoever becomes a subject of one, doth not thereby become a subject of the others; nor can he, who can challenge the freedom and liberties of one of them, thereby challenge the freedom and liberties of all the rest. Natural birth, or *civitatis donatio*, which we call naturalization, makes a member and subject of the one; but spiritual birth or baptism, makes a member and subject of the other; and as baptizing a foreigner in the Church of England doth not make him a citizen of the

[k] Rights, chap. i. § 5. p. 36.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XIII.

English nation, so neither doth his naturalization, as such, make him a member of the Church of England; because he may be an infidel, heretic, or excommunicate person, or a schismatic from the Catholic Church. These few suggestions shew that the Church and state are different societies, and independent of one another, and subsist by different powers, as they always do in ruptures of one from the other, however they happen; as when the Church abusing her power, and going beyond the limits of it, forces the state to defend itself against her by force; or on the other hand, when the state at any time happens to persecute the Church. I might also shew the difference between these two powers and societies, and the independency of one of them upon the other, from the diversity of their ends and objects; and the differing means, by which they obtain those different ends. But for that I refer my reader to the forecited *proœmium* of Du Pin[1]; and when he hath read it he will not wonder that all antiquity formerly admitted this distinction, as a principle fundamental to the Church; and that the emperor Valentinian I., upon the vacancy of the see of Milan[m], sending for the bishops of the province, spoke thus to them[n], "You know very well from the Scriptures what kind of man he ought to be, who is worthy of the high priesthood; that he should be a person who ought to instruct his subjects not only by his words, but by his works, setting forth himself as a pattern of all virtue, and his conversation as a testimony and proof of his doctrine. Wherefore now do you place such an one in the bishop's chair, that we who administer the empire, may with all sincerity bow down our heads to him, and receive his reprehensions as spiritual medicines; for we being but men, must of necessity sometimes do amiss." This he said upon principle before the election, in which St. Ambrose the governor of the place was chosen; and when he was conse-

[1] [Appendix, No. v.]

[m] [A.D. 374, on the death of Auxentius.]

[n] Theodoret., Eccl. Hist., lib. iv. cap. vi. [*ἵστε σαφῶς, ἅτε δὴ τοῖς θείοις λόγοις ἐντεθραμμένοι, ὁποῖον εἶναι προσήκει τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης ἠξιωμένον· καὶ ὡς οὐ χρὴ λόγῳ μόνῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ βίῳ τοὺς ἀρχομένους ῥυθμίζειν, καὶ πάσης ἀρετῆς ἑαυτὸν ἀρχετύπον προτιθέναι, καὶ μάρτυρα ἔχειν τῆς διδασκαλίας τὴν πολιτείαν· τοιοῦτον δὴ οὖν καὶ νῦν τοῖς ἀρχιερατικοῖς ἐγκαθιδρύσατε θώκοις, ὅπως καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ τὴν βασιλείαν ἰθύνοντες, εἰλικρινῶς αὐτῷ τὰς ἡμετέρας ὑποκλίνωμεν κεφαλὰς, καὶ τοὺς παρ' ἐκείνοι γενομένους ἐλέγχους (ἀνθρώπους γὰρ ὄντας καὶ προσπταίειν ἀνάγκη) ὡς ἰατρικὴν ἀσπασώμεθα θεραπείαν.*—Apud Eccl. Hist., tom. iii. p. 153.]

crated, "the most excellent emperor[o]," as the historian calls him, being present at the consecration, praised our Lord and Saviour in these words[o]; "Thanks be given to Thee our Almighty Lord and Saviour, who hath committed the government of souls to him, to whom I had committed the government of bodies, by which Thou hast declared that my opinion of him was just." This was that St. Ambrose, who in his tract of the Dignity of the Priesthood[p], shews the practice of Christian princes in these words: "Thou mayest see the necks of kings and princes bowed down to the knees of bishops, and kissing their right hands, as thinking themselves guarded with their prayers." It was then upon principle so much the practice of emperors to kiss the hands of bishops, that the tyrant Maximus, who set up for the empire, rose up in the council-chamber at Triers to kiss the hand of the same St. Ambrose[q], bishop of Milan, in his second ambassage to him from the young emperor Valentinian II., but Ambrose refused him that respect. Princes then thought themselves, like other men, subject to the sacerdotal power, of which they had the same notion after the union of the Church with the empire, as those Christians had who lived before it; and I doubt not but Tertullian's rule is good in defence of it and the Church against our author, *Quod apud multos unum invenitur, non est erratum, sed traditum*[r]; as likewise that of Vincentius Lirinensis, *Quod ab omnibus creditum, hoc vere Catholicum*[s].

[o] Rights, chap. vii. [*ὁ πάντα ἄριστος βασιλεὺς . . . . χάρις σοι δέσποτα παντόκρατορ καὶ σῶτερ ἡμέτερε, ὅτι τῷδε τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἐγὼ μὲν ἐνεχείρησα σώματα, σὺ δὲ ψυχάς· καὶ τὰς ἐμὰς ψήφους δικαίας ἀπέφηνας.*—Ibid., p. 154.]

[p] cap. ii. [quippe cum videas regum colla et principum submitti genibus sacerdotum, et, exosculata eorum dextra, orationibus eorum credant se communiri.—Pseudo-Ambrose de Dignitate Sacerdotali, S. Ambr. Op., tom. ii. App. p. 359, B. This tract is certainly not St. Ambrose's, though in the MSS., which are very numerous, it is with one exception attributed to him; in this one it is entitled 'Sermo Gilberti Philosophi, Papæ urbis Romæ, qui cognominatus est Silvester, de Informatione Episcoporum,' that is, Sylvester II. Pope from A.D. 999 to 1003. On this the Benedictine editors remark, 'Omnia et personæ et tempori satis congruunt.'—Monitum, p. 358.]

[q] Ambros. Epist. lvi. ad Valent. Imp. [Ubi sedit in consistorio ingressus sum, adsurrexit ut osculum daret. Ego inter consistorianos steti. Hortari cæperunt alii ut ascenderem: vocare ille. Respondi ego: quid oscularis eum quem non agnoveris.—S. Ambr., Epist. xxiv. Op., tom. ii. p. 888, E. ed. Ben. There is no reason to think it was the hand of St. Ambrose that he would have kissed. Of the tract de Dignitate Sacerdotali the Bened. editors remark, 'quod nihil contineat ab Ambrosii et ingenio et sæculo non alienum,' p. 357. For instances of the practice in the case of private Christians, see Bingham, Antiq., book ii. chap. ix. sect. 2.]

[r] De Præscriptione Hæreticorum c. 21. [c. 28. p. 212, A. ed. Ben.]

[s] [Quod ab omnibus creditum est, hoc . . . est vere proprieque Catholi-

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XIV.

That must be truly Catholic, which all Christians believed to be true.

Inconsistencies in Tindal's scheme.

His rage against the Church hath transported him so far, that in contradiction to his own principles, he hath argued down all civil governments, but such where there is but one, independent, supreme, despotic head or power. "If," saith he[t], "you allow more than one power in every society, there's no reason to stop at two." And[t], "if it be contrary to the nature of things that there should be more than one power in a family, every one sees, that the same invincible reason forbids more than one in a society made up of several families." .... "What hath been said proves that all supreme, or independent power must be indivisible[t]." This considered with the purpose for which he said it, to shew the inconsistency of two clashing powers, will make it necessary to have but one absolute master in a college, without a meeting of fellows to clash with him; one absolute mayor in a city, without a court of aldermen or common council to clash with him, and one despotic absolute king in every kingdom, without any parliament or parliamentary power to clash and interfere with him, and his one, independent, and indivisible power. Thus to prevent the absurdity of clashing and interfering powers, we must not only abolish the ecclesiastical power, but reform most of the civil constitutions of the world; and particularly we of this nation, ought to have no parliaments, or no kings, because they clash so often together, nor two independent houses of parliament, because they frequently quarrel and clash together, and sometimes encroach upon one another's rights. To be short, his argument taken from the clashing of powers, as an argument, is of as much force for the Church against the state, as for the state against the Church: for if the ecclesiastical power must be abolished, because it is independent on the civil, and when it is abused, interferes with it; for the same reason may a courtier of Rome, a Bellarmine, or Baronius say, the civil power must be taken away, because it is independent on the ecclesiastical, and when abused clashes and interferes with it, though it is of immediate Divine institution, and originally founded in the person and

cum.—Vincentii Lirinensis Commonitorium, § ii. Bibl. Vett. Patrum, tom. x. p. 103, C.]

[t] [Right, pp. 36, 37.]

office of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By this way of arguing, as I hinted before, man, whom God, though the God of order, hath made subject to two internal clashing powers, must entirely give up himself to one of the two, and when it comes to that, I do not doubt much to which of the two our author will surrender himself. The four new societies formed of late in a neighbouring nation, when it comes to the choice of which of the two clashing principles shall have the sole, supreme government of man, shew which shall have the most votes among some sorts of men.

TINDAL'S INCONSISTENCIES.

I must also observe, that by the very scheme he hath made to argue against the independency of the ecclesiastical power, he hath set up many independent, unaccountable powers in religion, as absurd and inconsistent with the power of the magistrate, as he pretends the power of the Church to be. For his own scheme excludes the magistrate from all power in religion, and religious matters; men having a natural right to 'believe[u], and profess such speculative matters which they think true, and to worship God after the manner they think most agreeable to His will; and that in all matters of religion, with respect to which they are always in a state of nature, they must determine for themselves, and follow the dictates of their own consciences, and also have a natural right to form themselves into companies, meetings, and churches for religious worship after their own way; and[x] to agree on some places, and on the persons to officiate, and to judge of the forms and modes of worship, and of the rites and ceremonies they will observe; in doing of all which the magistrate, who as to these things[y] hath no more power over the peasant, than he hath over him, is bound[z] to protect them; or if he do not, it[a] will force them to defend those natural rights by arms, of which no human power can deprive them.'

Here he doth not only give to all religious societies the same independent power which the Church claims to itself; but in such a manner, in which all true Churches have always abhorred to claim it, viz., that if the magistrate will not pro-

[u] See ibid., Introduction, pp. 14, 15, 23.
[x] Ibid., pp. 24, 25.
[y] Ibid. p. 24.
[z] Ibid., pp. 16, 24, 25.
[a] Ibid., pp. 17, 29.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XIV.

tect them in the choice and profession of their religion, they may, and, I think he means, ought to defend it by force of arms. Here is resistance added to the independent power of I know not how many pretended Churches, which the Church he writes against, and all true Churches ever disclaimed. The magistrate hath no power to persecute them; but if he according to his bounden duty will not protect them, they may against their natural, and sworn allegiance, persecute him by taking up arms against him, and in defence of their belief, and way of worship, turn the nation into a theatre of confusion, and a field of blood.

Let us suppose then, that there were the same heretical sect of Docetes among us, that was among the primitive Christians in the time of the Apostles[b], who denied the humanity of Christ, believing and professing that He had not a real body, but only in appearance, nor was really born, nor really crucified, nor really rose from the dead, but only in appearance; and as they were Gnostics, so also chose that impure manner of Eucharistical worship, which I intimated before, as most agreeable, in their corrupt sentiments, to the will of God: let us, I say, suppose this sect grown to great numbers and strength among us, as it might be double or treble to that of any other sect, and that her Majesty had declared she could not in conscience see her people any longer perverted by such an impure sect, and so destructive of the Christian faith, and thereupon had passed an act of parliament against all farther toleration of them; upon such a supposition our author by his principles, if he were one of them, must like the man of Belial, Sheba the son of Bichri, presently blow the trumpet, and cry out, 'To your tents, to your natural rights, O Israel; as to the choice and profession of our religion, we are still in a state of nature, the magistrates as to that, have no more power over us than we have over them; we never gave, or could give them a power to deprive us of this natural liberty; they cannot hinder us from meeting without manifest injustice; and therefore since

[b] 1 John i. 1—3; iv. 3. Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn. [§ ii. *ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα ἔπαθεν δι' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα σωθῶμεν· καὶ ἀληθῶς ἔπαθεν, ὡς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀνέστησεν ἑαυτόν· οὐχ ὥσπερ ἄπιστοί τινες λέγουσιν, τὸ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν πεπονθέναι, αὐτοὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ὄντες· καὶ καθὼς φρονοῦσιν, καὶ συμβήσεται αὐτοῖς, οὖσιν ἀσωμάτοις καὶ δαιμονικοῖς.*—Patres Apost., tom. ii. p. 34.]

TINDAL'S INCONSISTENCIES.

they act contrary to the main end, for which we intrusted them with power, and have exceeded their bounds in abridging our liberty in which they should protect us, the laws of nature not only permit, but oblige us to have recourse to arms; you see how we are persecuted[c] contrary to those laws, and to the honour of God, and the good of mankind: to your tents therefore with all speed to defend your natural freedom; only be strong, and of a good courage; we will do unto them as unto Sisera and Jabin, and make them like Zeba and Salmanna.'

It will be hard for him to name any one right, liberty, or privilege, which the Church, or, if he pleases, High Church, claims, independently on the magistrate, by Divine right, which he doth not demand in a manner, as independent of him, by natural right, for every society that pretends to be a Church. Is it the liberty of professing what they think is the true faith? So doth he for every sect. Is it the liberty to worship God in the manner they think most fit? So doth he for every sect. Is it the liberty to gather, and form Churches in all places for worship? So doth he for all men of the same faith, true or false, which he calls 'belief in speculative matters.' Is it the power of legislation, for which he is so incensed against the Church, for presuming to make canons or laws for the government, regulation, and well-being of her own body? This he also challenges for every other pretended Church. For if men have a natural right to form themselves into societies for profession of belief and Divine worship, they must also have a right to make laws and orders for the government and preservation of those societies, without which they can neither be formed, or subsist. Is it the power of jurisdiction, for which he hath written such bitter invectives against the Church, for presuming to censure her disorderly members, and in particular for assuming a power to herself of turning the contumacious and incorrigible out of her communion, and obliging those who are in it to shun them, and avoid all conversation with them? Even this power also he gives to every sect over its own members. For if men have a natural right to form societies, and make laws for the government and well-being of them, they must also

[c] Rights, p. 16. [See Introduction, § 19, 20. pp. 14—16.]

have a right to punish; because the power of making laws and orders, signifies nothing without a power to punish the transgressors of them; and therefore we find, that all religious fraternities among us take upon them, in a way of proceeding independent on the magistrate, to censure their own disorderly members, and not only to turn them out of their communion, when they are incorrigible, but to oblige[d] "every one of their society to be the executioners of their sentence, by enjoining them to shun and avoid them," whatsoever they suffer by it; though, according to his way of reasoning[e], it 'takes from the magistrate the right of depriving men of their trades and professions,' and 'causes the excommunicate person to lead a life more to be dreaded than death;' nay though 'the magistrate,' supposing he were of their communion, 'is not exempt from this punishment[f], since as a member of their society, he is but in a natural state,' and as subject to it as any peasant, over whom, in a society for the worship of God, "he hath no more power than the peasant hath over him[g]."

If he should say, that no religious society can oblige any but their own members to shun their excommunicates, and avoid all commerce and converse with him, I say the same of the Church; and here therefore must put him in mind of his artful way, to call it no worse, of expressing himself, where he declaims upon this subject in such manner, as if the clergy, 'those Christian Druids[h],' as he with great respect calls them, pretended to oblige[i] 'every one, and all people, to shun their excommunicates,' and 'become the executioners of their sentence;' whereas they can command none to do it, but the members of their own Church. If he saith, that the people of the Church of England are the great body of the nation, I must tell him that that is only accidental, and that it is his endeavour, and of many hundreds more, to make her the least of the tribes that pretend to religion among us; and that some of them, who are very numerous, expect their turn once more for a national Church. If he should say, that my reasoning against him from his own scheme is not just,

[d] Rights, p. 63.
[e] Ibid., pp. 38, 39.
[f] Ibid., p. 39.
[g] Ibid., p. 24.
[h] [Ibid., p. 43.]
[i] Ibid., pp. 39, 63.

TINDAL'S INCONSISTENCIES.

because the government of Churches, which he erects upon it, must be in the whole body, and not in any one order of men, but that the government of the Church of England is in a particular order of men, who call themselves the clergy; I answer, that as to the independency of the governing power upon the magistrate, it is all one, whether it be in a particular order, or in the whole body, in the priests, or in the people, because in which of the two soever it is seated, it is an independent power. Thus the Quakers, for instance, meet in vast numbers among us, not only for religious worship, but for government and discipline, for legislation and jurisdiction independently on the magistrate, and with a witness 'shun their excommunicates,' or those who seeing their error leave their communion, and oblige Friends all the world over 'to be the executioners of their sentence;' but I think they have not hitherto done it upon his scheme of a natural, but the pretence of a Divine right. But our author hath given them, and all religious societies pretending to an independent Divine right, another string to their bow; and I hope, as he cannot by his own principles, so he will not deny the body of the Church the benefit of it; and then as a body she is as exempt and independent on the magistrate, as even High Church, that "spiritual Babylon[k]," can wish.

The royal supremacy must fall down before his natural right, as Dagon did before the ark, because in matters of religion, and the administration of it, the magistrate "hath no more power over the meanest peasant, than the meanest peasant hath over him." The 25th Henry VIII. c. 19. can be no bar to this natural right of the whole body, though he cites it[l] "as a bar to the Divine right," which the clergy claim. The whole body will have a power of ecclesiastical legislature, be they few, or be they many, be they the national, or be they not the national Church, independent on our kings and queens, in or out of parliament; and they must be protected in their faith, their worship, their articles, their rites, and ceremonies; or else their natural right would authorize

[k] Rights, p. 33.

[l] Ibid. Pref., p. vii. ["If a legislative power belongs to the clergy by Divine right, it must be when they are assembled in convocation; but the 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19. is a bar to any such Divine right, because that act makes it no less than a præmunire for them so much as to meet without the king's writ," &c.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XIV.

them, could they believe it, to call the magistrate to account for breach of trust, which they reposed in him. When I speak of the body of the Church of England, I speak strictly of that body made up of the laity and clergy, which would at all times of trial and distinction adhere to the doctrine, worship, government, and discipline of their Church, according to which the people believe the clergy to be by Divine institution the governors of the Church, who have the power of spiritual legislation and jurisdiction, as well as of ordination. Such a 'Babylonish' Church of England as this in any condition, or any place of the world, or consisting of what numbers soever, by his scheme must have the common benefit of natural right, as well as other pretended Churches, and by consequence at home, or abroad, ought to be as perfectly independent of the magistrate, as they are, and according to his principle, ought to be. High Church itself may challenge all her independent powers by this right; and all the acts of parliament which he cites with so much pomp of vanity, and scorn, but to no purpose, against her, must give place to it. Thus what he thinks he hath pulled down with one hand, he hath built up with the other; and now let the magistrate consider what he hath got by the change of the divine for the natural, of the old for the new claim of ecclesiastical power. Let him consider which of the independent powers, which of the Babylons he will choose, that built upon natural, or that upon Divine right; and in particular, whether he will have the Church of England challenge her independent powers in virtue of this, like an humble matron with prayers and tears, or in virtue of that, like Bellona with her casque on her head, and her sword in her hand. He saith[m], that "they who pretend to set up two independent powers do in effect confound both." What hath he then done, who instead of one independent power of the magistrate hath set up an hundred as independent of him; who instead of one "Babylon," as he calls the hierarchy of the Church, hath set up an hundred Babels of confusion, an hundred 'independent ruling powers in the same society,' an hundred 'souls in the same body politic[n]?' These are his

[m] Rights, p. 35. chap. i. § 3.

[n] [Ibid., § 4. "To imagine two such powers ruling the body politic, is as absurd as to suppose two souls in-

own ways of arguing, and by the laws of controversy I must demand the benefit of them against himself. TINDAL'S INCONSISTENCIES.

I have already given the reader specimens enough of the fraudulent and contradictory ways of reasoning which this author useth, and might give many more, were it necessary for me to go through his book.

SECT. XV. Of the Original of Government.

Sometimes he argues for the bare possibility of a thing which in fact never was[o]; as of people's going out by consent once upon a time, he knows not when, out of a state of nature into a state of government, contrary to the history of the creation, which as soon as the Greeks came to the knowledge of, they turned from that pagan account of government to the Christian, which taught how government had its original from God, in one man and one woman the first parents of mankind. There never was any absurd opinion more effectually baffled and exposed than this of his, in the Rehearsal in answer to Mr. Locke[p], but he, as if it were an uncontested principle, hath built his book upon it, and the foundation being false, the superstructure he hath erected upon it falls to the ground. He tacitly confesses, that government could not have been so set up by a great number in a state of nature. Saith he, "if a few at first agreed on a common empire, it was sufficient if others, by their actions, acknowledged an authority so advantageous to them." Here his meaning is somewhat uncertain; for if by few he means a

dependent of one another to govern the body natural."]

[o] Rights, p. 8. [See pp. 3, sqq.]

[p] [Rehearsal, No. 24, Jan. 13, 1704-5.

"The body of the people cannot so much as choose representatives for themselves," &c.

No. 38, April 12, 1705.

"Thou hast hewed him down by asserting that the consent of every individual was necessary to the erection of government, and he is as sensible as thou art that this is impossible. . . . Yet he makes the consent of every individual to be necessary, and the only foundation of all political societies.—Mr. Lock's two treatises of Government, book ii. chap. 8."

No. 176. Jan. 22, 1705-6.

"There are two difficulties as to people giving up their own rights. 1st. Whether they ever did do it. 2ndly. Whether they had any right to do it. The first cannot be shewed from any history or account of things since the beginning of the world. They have often been pressed to shew it, but they cannot.

"Nay I have shewed it to be impossible, because there is no way possible to collect the votes of every individual, which Mr. Lock makes necessary to it.

"And as for the second, Mr. Lock says that men cannot give an absolute power over their own lives, liberties, and properties to any government whatsoever. . . . Because no man hath power of his own life, and therefore cannot give that power to another. . . .

"To this I answered that all governments whatsoever . . . were absolute and arbitrary, and that it was impossible it should be otherwise. For that there must be a dernier resort somewhere, or else there could be no government."]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XV.

few of many actually in being at the same time, then he must tell us how a multitude of men co-existing in a state of nature, came to give a few their several authorities to consent for them to go out of the state of nature into a state of government. But if by a few he means two or three men and women at the first, and no more, and by others those who descended from them, then it supposes this grand absurdity, that men and women born in a state of government, are born in a state of nature too, and remain in it till by their actions at least they shall give their consent to the government in which they are born. This I think is his meaning. For, saith he, "why people should not take this way to come out of the state of nature at first, as they have done ever since, there can be no manner of reason[q]." This is one of the confident ways of speaking usual with him, against many reasons to the contrary given in the Rehearsal[r], to which I refer him and the reader. "And they," saith he, "who make this objection, (that government could not come at first from consent, because it cannot be presumed that all parties met together to give an express consent,) may as well argue that no language could be of human institution; because words not signifying any thing naturally, we cannot imagine that all should meet together to agree that such sounds shall have such ideas annexed to them. And yet this depends not only on the agreement of those who spoke any language at first, but of those who have done it since[s]."

This very comparison shews the precarious and absurd nature of the original of government, according to his scheme. First, it is as precarious to suppose that a few men came together to form the first government, as that

[q] [Rights, Introd., § 10. p. 8.]

[r] [Rehearsal, No. 156, Nov. 13, 1706. "(He) has stumbled, instead of it, (Locke's View,) upon a ten times more foolish and less tenable notion; which is, that men have not power over their own lives (Introd., p. 10, § 14.) or liberties, but that every man has power over another man's life, &c., and that government was founded upon this foot. . . .

"*Countryman.* Therefore men agreed upon government to divest themselves of these natural powers, and put them into the hands of their governors to prevent all these evils.

"*Rehearsal.* Can a man divest himself of his natural powers? Can he divest himself of the power to defend himself? Even against his governors if he thinks they do him injustice? And every man is judge of that for himself. . . . Besides, the old contradiction remains . . . How mankind could do it, when they could not all meet personally. . . ."—See also Nos. 165, &c.]

[s] Rights, Introd., § 10. p. 8.

any number of men ever came together to form the first language; and both suppositions are equally contrary to the most philosophical, most rational, Scripture account both of the original of government and languages, before and after the flood. Secondly, it is absurd, because as the agreement of a small number of men together, that such sounds should have such ideas annexed to them, supposeth they must have had some common speech in which they understood one another, and came to such an agreement; so the meeting of a small number of men and women together to form government, and to agree on a common umpire, supposes an antecedent consent and agreement to meet and debate, and choose that umpire, and form government; and that antecedent consent and agreement, which could not be without government, must have been before the government, which he supposeth to be first. And to carry on his comparison in his own words[t], as 'making additions or alterations in any language by the express or tacit consent of those who use it,' supposes they first had that common language; so the consent of a few men met together to agree upon government, supposes some antecedent order, and government, and consent, to meet and agree together in passing from the state of nature to a state of government, which implies a contradiction. But admit his worthy suppositions were not attended with this absurdity, I am sure it is attended with another, which highly reflects on the wisdom of God, to put men into a state of nature, and leave them, like savages, to wander up and down in it, without any common language, and to meet together, one knows not how nor when, to hem and haw out their consent for this or that form of government, and agree upon an umpire, or trustee, with conditions that he should be accountable for his ministry to them; which, to use his own words, "is to banter the magistrate with the same conditions that Trincalo allowed to his rival Stephano, when he told him, 'thou shalt indeed be viceroy over me, provided I be viceroy over thee[u].'" I am sure, let

ORIGIN OF GOVERNMENT.

[t] Rights, Introd., § 10. p. 8.

[u] [Ibid., p. 60. The words quoted do not occur in the Tempest, but in the Enchanted Island, Shakespear's play altered by Davenant and Dryden, (see Preface,) Act ii. Scene i. p. 16, London, 1674. The parties are not Stephano and Trinculo, but Mustacho, Stephano's mate, and Ventoso a mariner. Stephano claims to be duke, and

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XV.

him say of atheists what he will, a Christian must be little better, that will set up such a scheme, and ought to be 'reckoned[x]' not only as 'an enemy' to Christianity, but to all government, 'as subverting the foundations' of both; and[y] by his own way of reasoning not only 'the magistrate,' but every man 'hath a right to punish' such a writer, as much as 'the deniers of a Divine being,' since these are but very little, if at all, more injurious to Christianity and government, than he.

And as he argues for the possibility of this most absurd original of government, against another way or matter of fact, by which it came into the world; so elsewhere[z] he reasons against another matter of fact, of which God was the author, as ridiculous, impossible, and absurd. This matter of fact is God's institution and erection of a visible spiritual kingdom, in the kingdoms of this world, under the government of powers distinct from, and independent on, the powers of the world, by which they who are vested with those powers are made mutually subject to one another. This he positively charges with absurdity; "Then," saith he[a], "as to governors themselves, what can be more absurd, that one can be subject to, and sovereign of the same person?" And in another place[b] he compares this independency of the two powers, and their mutual subjection to each other, to the banter of Trincalo in the play, who allowed his competitor Stephano to be 'his viceroy, so he might be viceroy over him.' It is most certain, that, if such an institution be absurd, God cannot be the author of it; and therefore let us enquire, whether indeed it implies absurdity, or contradiction, for two different potentates invested with different powers, to be subjects and superiors to each other; for if it is not absurd or impossible with men, we may be sure it is practical and possible with God. The question then is, whether two superiors, or two sovereigns, may not be subject to one another in different re-

appoints Mustacho as his viceroy; but Ventoso objects; on which Mustacho says, "Stephano hear me. I will speak for the people, because there are few, or rather none in the isle to speak for themselves. Know then that to prevent the farther shedding of Christian blood, we are all content Ventoso shall be viceroy, upon condition I may be viceroy over him."]

[x] Rights, p. 12. [See above, p. 184.]

[y] Ibid.

[z] Ibid., p. 50 [chap. i. § 29.]

[a] Ibid.

[b] Ibid., p. 60.

ORIGIN OF GOVERNMENT.

spects; for it is most certain, that in the same respect, one cannot be subject and sovereign to the same person, though in different respects he may. So, according to his own scheme of government, the people appoint the magistrate to be sovereign over them with the same condition that Trincalo allowed Stephano to be viceroy, provided that they, when they think fit, may be sovereign over him. Here is the magistrate, without any absurdity, as he must acknowledge, in different respects sovereign of, and subject to, his people; sovereign, upon condition he rules well, and subject, when he doth not. Upon the former condition they are accountable to him, but upon the latter he is accountable to them; in one respect he hangs them, and in the other respect they depose or behead him. This is no absurdity with our author, and yet it must be absurd, though by God's appointment, for the king to be subject to the priest in one respect, as the priest is subject to him in another. But to take no advantage against him from his own scheme, this great pretended absurdity hath been, and is daily practised among men. Kings in different respects have been, and may be mutually subjects and sovereigns, as in virtue of their feudal lands and dominions, which they hold of one another. Nay they may be so subject and supreme to each other, by having free or allodial lands and lordships in one another's dominions, and among subjects and superiors of other societies nothing is more common. My lord mayor of London, as member of any of the twelve companies, is subject to the master of it, and the master of it as a member of the city is subject to him, as lord mayor. [Surely the civilian knew that[c]] among the Romans[d] the sons of families were capable of the great magistracies, while they were under the power of their fathers, and members of their families; in which case, when it happened, the father was subject to the son in his civil, and the son to the father in his domestic capacity, without any absurdity in government. So if the queen is pleased to confer the honour of knighthood, or any greater dignity, on a minor of a family,

[c] [Supp., 1715, No. 10, p. 9. See note a. p. 48.]

[d] [Instit., lib i. tit. 12. sect. 4. de Dignitate. Filius familias si militaverit, vel si senator vel consul factus fuerit remanet in potestate patris. Militia enim vel consularis dignitas de patris potestate filium non liberat.]

whose father is but a gentleman, he must have precedence of his father abroad, and his father must take place of him at home. And at court the same great officers are subject to those above stairs, who are subject to them below. And I need not spend time in shewing how kings by different grants or commissions, can make the same persons in different respects superior and inferior to one another, and the same body of men in different relations subject to two independent powers and jurisdictions. I imagine our author himself will not deny but that the magistrate, for example a king or queen of the Church of England, may make themselves subject to the clergy in what we call spirituals, as they are subject to them in temporals; and if it is possible for the magistrate himself to do it, I hope it is no absurdity or impossibility for God to oblige the magistrate to that, to which he can oblige himself. If kings, who are earthly sovereigns, can subject the same society, or same number of men in different respects and capacities, to two inferior independent powers; surely God, who is Lord paramount, and supreme above all kings, may do the same; and whether He hath done it, or no, is, as I must observe again, a question about matter of fact, which I hope is proved in the following letters, especially in the second, by the authority of such judges[e] as he confesses taught that doctrine, and the testimony and evidence of such witnesses, as our author, and his club, and all their allies among atheists, theists, and unitarians of all sorts, here, or elsewhere, in this age of latitude and innovation, will never be able to counterpoise.

He is very frank in allowing the magistrate a power to deprive the clergy, and with great pleasure insults them again and again with the depriving acts since the reign of Henry VIII., though the power of depriving, with which he vests the magistrate against them, be a flat contradiction to his own scheme of government, in which he divests him of it, and to his notion of deprivation, which, he saith[f], is but 'an agreement in any Church or congregation, to hear their minister no longer, or to own him any more for their minister;' or, as

[e] ["Notions, which were by degrees, under the shelter of the authority of fathers and councils, introduced again in favour of an independent power."] —Rights, p. 218.

[f] Rights, chap. ii. § 16, p. 80.

he speaks somewhere else, to let him know 'they have no farther occasion for his service.' To which I answer *ad hominem*, first, that, according to his positions, our kings or queens can have no hand in depriving ministers, but those of the Churches to which they belong; because a member of one Church cannot vote to deprive the minister of another. And secondly, that they have no more power in depriving of their ministers, than any other fellow member hath; the ecclesiastical power in all the instances of it being, as he affirms, by natural right, in the whole body[g], in which, as I have shewed above, "the prince hath no more power over the peasant, than the peasant hath over him[h]." In like manner neither will his scheme allow the members of parliament any power to deprive or depose ministers, but those of their own Churches, in which the people without doors, though the members of both houses were all of one Church, imagine of the Church of England, would have as much power as they. ORIGIN OF GOVERNMENT.

I have observed above, that what he hath said against the revenues of the Church, reflects upon the wisdom of God, who made such plentiful provision for the Jewish clergy, even, as learned men have computed, to a fifth part of the valuation of the whole land. And I must here observe, that it is expressly contrary to the Scriptures, as any man may see in 1 Cor. ix. [1—14] and the other texts cited in the margin[i], as also to the constant practice of the ancient Church, as Sempil[k], Nettles[l], Tillesly[m], and Montague[n] have proved against Mr. Selden, whose spiteful spirit to the clergy is descended in a double portion on this writer, who will neither allow God

[g] See Rights, pp. 84, 80, 57.

[h] [Ibid., p. 24.]

[i] 1 Thess. ii. 6; 2 Thess. iii. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 9—12; Gal. vi. 6.

["The tacking the priests' preferments to such opinions not only makes them in most nations, right or wrong, to espouse them, and to invent a thousand sophistical and knavish methods of defending them, &c."—Rights, p. 23.]

[k] [Sir James Sempil, a Scottish knight, in a work of which the title is, Sacrilege sacredly handled. London, 1619. An appendix also added answering some observations moved, namely against this treatise and some others, I find in Jos. Scaliger's Diatribe, and Joh. Selden's History of Tithes.]

[l] [Stephen Nettles, B.D., in an Answer to the Jewish part of Mr. Selden's History of Tithes. Oxford, 1625.]

[m] [Richard Tillesly, D.D., archdeacon of Rochester, in Animadversions upon Mr. Selden's History of Tithes, and his review thereof. London, 1619. Second edition, corrected and much enlarged, 1621.]

[n] [Richard Montague, afterwards bishop of Chichester and of Norwich. "Diatribe upon the first part of the late History of Tithes," &c. 1621.

Tillesly enters fully into the practice of the ancient Church; the others confine themselves almost entirely to the questions about the Jewish tithes.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XV.

nor the king a power to settle revenues upon the priesthood[o]. I must also observe how he slanders the clergy in saying[p], that they claim a right to the tenth part of men's lands, unless he'll say by 'lands' he meant the fruits and product of the lands, and to them indeed they may claim a right from God, who hath, as he thinks he wittily speaks, 'tacked them[q]' to the priesthood, as the authors above mentioned, and many other learned men, have proved. Somewhere he speaks of them, as of a "robbing of the people," and when time shall serve, he can treat the lands and revenues of the crown in the same manner, and then will make no difficulty to say, that the people could never authorize the magistrate to receive, or their representatives to give, such and such burdensome, enormous, and ruinous taxes, and rob them against their natural rights, from which they have no power to recede. His repeated arguments against the revenues of the Church, put me in mind of a story I have heard of the famous Harry Martin[r], who meeting with a worthy divine of his acquaintance, that was turned out of his benefice in those times, embraced and kissed him, saying in banter and mockery, 'My dear doctor, how do'st do? I'faith I am glad to see thee; for nobody loves a POOR clergyman better than I do.' This kind of love our author and his gang have in great store for the

[o] Rights, pp. 17, 22, 23, 25. [Selden only denied the right of the Christian clergy to tithes, jure divino. Tindal maintained that the magistrate ought not to allow them. P. 17, "men will be discouraged from impartially examining those opinions to which preferments are attached . . . and therefore all awes and bribes are religiously to be avoided." pp. 22, 23, "if it be the highest injustice to force men to profess such speculative opinions as they do not believe, it cannot savour much of justice to make them contribute to the support of them, &c."—See also p. 25.]

[p] Ibid., p. 183, ["one particular of their claims...viz., their having a right to the tenth part not only of men's lands, but what far exceeds it, of the product of their labour and industry."]

[q] Ibid., p. 23.

[r] [The person referred to is Harry Martin, the regicide, "a person most deeply engaged in all the late miseries in the kingdom, and in the most infamous and bloody part of them, and all with such a merry and careless air, as is scarce to be credited upon such a melancholy occasion. His natural parts, his sharp repartees, and his exceeding apt instances, made him not only the sport and diversion, but very often the manager and director of the Long Parliament. Having spent a noble paternal estate, and vast sums gained by plunder, or given by parliament, upon his debaucheries, he was upon the Restoration condemned to die; but in conclusion confined to Chepstow castle in Monmouthshire, where he continued prisoner for twenty years, in a poor wretched condition, being glad to receive a pot of ale from any that would give it him; and thus low in spirits, and his wit exhausted, he died suddenly with meat in his mouth in the 78th year of his age, in 1680."—Echard's History of England, vol. ii. p. 1002.]

ORIGIN OF GOVERNMENT.

clergy. Could they starve the men, they think they could soon starve the order, and quickly get rid of priests, 'a sort of fellows,' as one is reported to have said particularly of bishops, 'that have troubled the world ever since the time of the Apostles,' and, maugre the malice of these men, and the devil's, I trust will still trouble it unto the end of the world.

He inveighs in many places against those of the clergy, who, believing the Church to be a society distinct from the state, and independent of it, think that the magistrate hath not power of depriving[s], though he himself hath taken this power from him, and makes no difficulty to deny him the "right to issue out writs *de excommunicato capiendo*," and by consequence, of a power to make laws for such writs. And he commends the clergy, as he is pleased to miscall the presbyterian ministry of Scotland, for "not suffering the magistrate to back their excommunication with temporal force[t]." To which I will take upon me to reply, that the magistrate in Scotland hath highly compensated the Kirk for the want of that assistance, by an act for taking away patronage[u], by another against toleration, and by another of additional securities for the Kirk, by which if a man should write in Scotland against the Kirk, and its power, and ministry, as he hath done against the Church in England, he would be soon put in a condition of never writing or speaking more. I believe, if the clergy of the Church of England should upon such terms desire the magistrate no longer to 'back their excommunications,' he, if asked, would tell him, that they were 'most unreasonable, inconsistent with the natural rights of the people, that they tended to slavery; and that when men came out of a state of nature into a state of government, they never gave, nor could give the magistrate such exorbitant and destructive power.'

[s] [Rights, pp. 37, 54, 55.]

[t] [Ibid., chap. i. § 37, p. 57. 1690, July 19. An act rescinding several acts of parliament as useless or hurtful; annuls "all acts enjoining civil pains upon sentences of excommunication." The acts of the parliament of Scotland, vol. ix. p. 198. ed. 1810.

[u] 1690, July 19. Act concerning patronages.—Ibid., p. 196.

1690, June 7. Act ratifying the confession of faith, and settling Presbyterial government.—Ibid., p. 138.

On the 1st of June, 1704, an act for a toleration of all Protestants in the exercise of religious worship, being read, a representation against it was offered in the name of the late general assembly, and it was dropped.—Boyer's Reign of Queen Anne, p. 65. 1722.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XV.

He endeavours to prove, in several places of his book[x], that "no one more than another," women not excepted, "can be reckoned a priest from Scripture." This is a great part of a book published four or five years since with this title: "The Principles of the Protestant Religion explained, in a Letter of Resolution to a Lady[y];" and, as hath been observed[z], was fully refuted in an answer, entitled, "The Necessity of Church Communion, printed by A. and J. Churchill, 1705," and thither I refer the reader; only I cannot but observe, for the honour of this worthy author, that it is one of his fraudulent practices to write after, and out of other books that have been already confuted, without taking notice of the answers to them, as I shall hereafter shew. The reasons he gives are these: first, "because the only sacrifices of our religion are prayers, praises, and thanksgivings, which every one of the congregation offers up for himself[a];" which is a reason levelled against all priesthood, the Jewish as well as the Christian, and the priesthood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus; to which, as I have observed before, these men are as much enemies as to the priesthood of His ministers, through which it is their design to wound that. By this way of reasoning there can be no such office as a master of requests to any earthly sovereign, because men

[x] Rights, chap. iii. § 26; iv. § 15, pp. 108, 130.

[y] [This tract was published in 1704. It was written by the author of the Account of the Growth of Deism, and is the seventh of his tracts which were reprinted in one volume in 1709, to which edition the references below are made. The author is alluded to by Hickes, both in this work and in the preface to the Apologetical Vindication, as being a clergyman.

The question discussed in the tract is, "Whether it is necessary for a Christian man to join himself publicly to some (one or other) Church communion of Christians?"—p. 182. It is decided (p. 196) not to be "necessary to make a man a good Christian," but highly conducive to an easy and quiet life: and the communion of the Church is recommended, even though one does not believe its most essential doctrines, as original sin, the holy Trinity, the incarnation, (p. 206,) which are treated in a sneering tone. The reasons given are, first, because it is established; secondly, because Church people are more agreeable, and their preachers better educated than dissenters; third, because it is the strongest. The part referred to in the text is p. 192. "That Christian communion which you read of as practised in the Apostles' days was nothing else but a religious conversation of Christians with one another. 'Twas for society's sake that they went from house to house, that they ate and drank together frequently, &c. Now 'tis plain that this may be kept up without either priest or altar. ..." p. 193. "Had any of these women named a blessing upon that bread, we have no reason to doubt that God would have heard her prayer."

[z] Preface to the Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England, [where extracts from the book are given.]

[a] [Rights, p. 108.]

who present their petitions by his hands also offer them to the king themselves; and when the priests of the Jews offered up sacrifices for the whole congregation, or for single persons, the offerers also offered them up for themselves, and at the same time our Sovereign High-Priest in heaven intercedes for us when we pray, and makes our prayers acceptable to God, we also 'offer up our prayers for ourselves.' He farther saith, that "every one, as well as the minister," may "apply the bread and wine to the same holy and spiritual use;" so every man may set or apply the king's broad or privy seal; but is every man commissioned to do it, or can every man do it with effect, or without treason? It is not what every man may or can naturally do, but what he is lawfully empowered to do, in ecclesiastical as well as civil societies. But power of ministering in churches of his erection is entirely founded on the natural right, which every congregation hath to choose its own ministers, men or women, it matters not; and this natural right, he saith, the primitive Christians made use of in forming of churches, though, as I have shewed above, they never mentioned this natural right when they were questioned for what they did; but of the power, and right, and authority that they received from God, as St. Paul did in the salutations of all his Epistles, in his apologies from the heavenly vision, and Peter and John, when they said unto the magistrates, "We ought to obey God rather than men." The Apostles never styled themselves the servants and ministers of the people, in our author's sense, but of God, and Jesus Christ, who was sent from God, and the people's "servants for Jesus' sake."

ORIGIN OF GOVERNMENT.

Acts 22. 3—21; 26. 19. Acts 4. 19; 5. 21.

2 Cor. 4. 5.

But against this Divine right and commission he hath set up the unalienable natural right[b], which he supposes men brought with them, from his precarious and absurd state of nature, into a civil state of government; and his whole book, which he hath founded on this scheme, must sink with it, till he can defend it against what I have said above, and against the Rehearsal, who to this present moment hath again and again challenged him to defend himself.

He hath the modesty[c], as he thinks very wittily, to liken a convocation to "my Lord Tumond's cocks, who, though at

[b] [See Rights, pp. 28, 29.]

[c] Ibid., chap. vi. § 18, p. 204.

first sight they seem all of a side, yet are no sooner put together than they will spur at one another;" and that "if a prince had a mind to ruin a Church unperceived, he need only allow a convocation liberty to sit as long as they pleased." To what I have said above in answer to this spiteful reflection upon the differences of the clergy in synods and councils, I will only put him in mind, that Legion[d], when they please, can say the same thing of parliaments, or any other meeting of Christians, which they did not like, and that there was one, and but one parliament, whom the prince allowed to sit as long as they pleased, who ruined both King, Church, and Kingdom, and by their quarrels and contentions within doors, brought themselves from two honourable houses, with the king, according to law, at the head of them, to a most vile and contemptible rump in one tyrannical house, cursed by God, and hated by men. I have heard of a young lady, who by reading romances became a she Timon, because after long observation she could not find one such hero among men, as she found in those fictitious histories; and I think our Timon of priests and priesthood altogether as mad, though not so innocent as she. For all his invectives against the clergy for their faults, and particularly for their dissensions in synods, amounts to no more than that they are men, and like other men and Christians, when they meet together. But if God would please these malicious and other peevish malevolents of the clergy, he must give them priests without human infirmities; if I may say it, romantic priests, priests who have no less than the ideal perfection both of men and Christians, or else he must overrule the freedom of their wills, and make them impec-

[d] [This name was first adopted in an address to the House of Commons, sent on occasion of the imprisonment of six gentlemen of Kent, by order of the House of Commons, for presenting a petition from the grand jury and freeholders of their county, which the house voted "scandalous, insolent, and seditious," in 1701. A packet was put into the hands of the speaker (it was said) by the reputed writer, Defoe, in the disguise of a woman, which contained a letter to the speaker and a memorial to the house. It purposed to come "from them who have both a right to require and power to compel, the people of England," and was signed "our name is Legion, and we are many." The same signature was adopted in other similar papers in the years 1702 and 1703; which contain very violent language against parliaments. They are printed in Somers' collection of Tracts, vol. xi. pp. 255—273, second edition. The last was signed "Our name is million, and we are more." See Ralph's Hist. of England, vol. ii. pp. 946—953.]

cable and heroically good by irresistible grace. But why do I say, if God would please them? For I have shewed above[e], if He should make angelical men, or angels, priests, He could not please them, especially if they pretended to make creeds, or to be sent by God, and to be His ministers, and not the servants of the people, or to be their servants only for Jesus' sake, and by authority derived from Him. I once heard a debate between two gentlemen, whereof one was a great enemy and the other a friend to the clergy. The former inveighed bitterly against them upon the account of their pride, covetousness, and other vices, which our author is most liberal in charging of them with. After which the latter having said many other things in their defence, prayed him to tell what kind of men he would have priests to be. In answer to this, he made a description of men in such perfection of moral and Christian virtues as are not commonly to be found, though sought for with the cynic's lantern. Sir, replied the other, I wish to God that not only all priests, but all Christians were such men: but pray, Sir, do you know the number of clergymen we have in the nation? No, Sir, said he; but why do you ask that question? To inform you, replied the friend of the clergy, there are about twelve thousand clergymen in this nation; and I pray you to consider, if there are twelve thousand such men, or half that number in our whole country, as you would have priests to be. In truth, replied the other most ingenuously, after some pause, I think there are not; but I never considered this before, and hereafter I assure you, Sir, I will never speak against our clergy as I have been wont to do.

ORIGIN OF GOVERNMENT.

I leave the application of this story to our author, and his club, who have exaggerated all the faults and failings of the clergy in their single, and in their synodical capacities, without truth, without mercy, and without making allowances for them as men. Amongst the rest, he hath one most invidious, as well as false way of speaking of them through his whole book, after this manner[f], their "assuming to themselves the power, &c.," and[g] their "putting themselves in the place of God." And if he pleases he may say the same of

[e] p. 154. [f] Rights, pp. 84, 85. [g] Ibid., p. 95.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XV.

my lord mayor, or any other subordinate magistrate, that they assume to themselves such and such power, and put themselves in place of the king. Nay, he may say the same of our kings and queens, whom the laws acknowledge to be supreme next under God, that they assume to themselves the sovereign power over the people, and put themselves in the place of God, whose ministers they pretend to be. In truth, there is nothing that he hath said against the ecclesiastical, but what he and his party may, and if ever they see a proper time for it, will say against the regal power; and the very same artillery by which they have attempted to batter down the mitre, they will, if ever they see a season for it, turn upon the crown. The same way of reasoning will serve them as well against kingcraft and kings, as priestcraft and priests; and then what kings and emperors have done amiss from Nimrod to this day, without any distinction of reigns or persons, shall all be laid to the charge of kingship and kings. The power of our kings and queens, which our laws and lawyers declare to be independent, they hate as much, and for the same reason, as the independent power of the Church, and will say of that, as in allusion to another author, he saith of this[h], that it is a millstone which the clergy "hang about the neck of the Church, and by the monstrous weight of it do as much as in them lies to sink it."

SECT. XVI. The mission of the clergy, and their credentials.

He ridicules priests, for "saying they are God's ambassadors to the people," because they cannot work miracles to prove their mission, "it being the prerogative of God alone to choose His own ambassadors." "Christ and His Apostles," saith he, "as they were commissioned by God, so they brought their credentials with them visible to mankind, viz., the power of working miracles; but what credential, or what mission can these gentlemen pretend to? or what gospel never [before] known to the world are they to discover[i]?" Is not this pleasant to hear an infidel, who laughs at miracles at one time, arguing from them at another? But this he doth in spite to the clergy, because, according to his scheme,

[h] Rights, p. 185. ["What Archbishop Tillotson says of transubstantiation, that it is a millstone hung about the neck of popery, which will sink it at last."]

[i] Ibid., chap. ii. § 14, p. 78.

they do not take their mission from the people, and own themselves to be the servants of the flocks over whom they are bishops and priests. In answer to which, I think I may justly say of this band of men, in the head of which our author hath put himself against the clergy, that "an evil and adulterous generation seeketh after signs and wonders," which if they saw they would not believe. Instead of believing, I have reason to think from what they have published, and from what I hear now and then of their private conversations, that if our Lord and His Apostles were to teach the same things, and work the same miracles among us, which they did among the Jews, that they would crucify Him, and put them to death. They would tell Him, as the Jews did, that He was a blasphemer, that He made Himself equal with God, and "assumed His prerogative in forgiving of sins," that He set up Himself, and His "independent power" against Cæsar: and of them they would say, that "they put themselves in God's place," set up another king, one Jesus, in whose name they did all things contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, and "by a pretended independent power derived from Him, set up one power and authority within another in all places," to "clash, and interfere with" the empire, and imperial laws. Have I not reason to think so of these men, from what is collected out of their writings in the Axe laid to the Root of Christianity[k]; and in particular from what is there cited out of a book in great esteem among them, An Account of the Growth of Deism[l]? wherein the

CREDENTIALS OF CLERGY.

Matt.12.39. John 4. 48.

[k] [See note k, p. 53.]

[l] [The title of this work is, An Account of the Growth of Deism in England. It was first published in 1696, and was reprinted "with other tracts of the same author," 8vo. London, 1709, the seventh of which was the Letter of Resolution, &c. (see p. 212.) To which are added, Sir Robert Howard's History of Religion, (see note, p. 121.) Mr. Marvel's History of Councils, (see note, p. 151.) And Mr. Stephens' Sermon before the House of Commons, Jan. 30, 1699, (see note h, p. 52.) The author professes to be a sincere Christian, and that his design in writing is, to point out the causes of unbelief; this he attributes to the dogmatical, mysterious, and sacerdotal character of the religion of the Church, putting forward the objections of the deists, which lie against Christianity itself, as made by them to himself; of these the passage in the text is one. The character of the book may be fairly judged of by extracts from a pamphlet, called, Reflexions upon a Pamphlet entitled an Account, &c. London, 1696. p. 5, "That is indeed the title of it, but I believe not the author's design. . . . Whether the author be a Christian or no, I shall not pretend to determine; I would willingly suppose he is, since he seems to say so, but it looks as if he were uneasy that such good arguments against Christianity should lie hid only amongst his clubs of atheists and deists; and that he was willing to try

author saith[m], "If those writings which (the clergy) call [holy] Scriptures, are of their side, . . . I make no doubt but they were of their own inventing, and if Jesus Christ their patron laid the foundation of those powers, which both Popish and Protestant clergy claim to themselves [from] under Him, I think the old Romans did Him right in punishing Him with the death of a slave." These are the powers, the independent powers, which our author calls "the spiritual Babylon," and I believe every man, who reads his book with observation, cannot but confess, that it is written against those spiritual powers, which Christ, and His Apostles, and those whom the Apostles sent, exercised in a manner independent on the empire, with as much couched blasphemy and malice, as the Growth of Deism, or any other of their books more plainly express.

In the second place, I must be so free as to tell these gentlemen, that they may as well require the credentials of miracles from us for our doctrines, as well as for our mission, and equally reject both, because God doth not now bear us witness, as He did to our Lord, and His Apostles, "with signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost." Our want of miraculous credentials equally affects both, and I doubt not but it was our author's intention that it should; but as he must give me leave to tell him that our mission is the same that it was in the beginning of the third century[n], when miracles were ceasing; so it is the same ever since they quite ceased; and I must also remind him, that the more ancient Christians of the following ages, and we after their example, think not our mission or our doctrines the less credible for want of miracles; first, because we are as certain, as we can be of any matter of fact, which we do

how many proselytes they were like to gain by being exposed to public view."

There are several blasphemous extracts from this work in the Axe, &c. It was (erroneously) attributed to Sir R. Howard in the Rehearsal, No. 137, Sept. 7, 1706. "This book was said to be written by a man of note, who wrote plays and the History of Religion;" it is also noticed as a sign of the growth of deistical opinions. "This bitter root has of late years spread strangely among us," and No. 168, Tuesday, Dec. 24, 1706, connected with the Rights, "This has been growing up of late years, and now is summed up and completed in this celebrated book of the Rights."]

[m] [Rights, p. 185, Tindal speaks of "the ingenious author of the Growth of Deism."]

[n] Origenes contra Celsum, lib. ii. p. 62. *τεράστια ὧν κἂν ἴχνη ἐπὶ ποσὸν παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς εὑρίσκεται, [καὶ τινά γε μείζονα· καὶ εἰ πιστοί ἐσμεν λέγοντες ἑωράκαμεν καὶ ἥμεῖς.*—Op., tom. i. p. 392, B.]

not see, that the truth of both was sealed by many miracles for succeeding ages; secondly, because our Lord foretold us, that we were to believe upon the testimony of miracles not seen, when He said to Thomas, who doubted of His resurrection, "Thomas, because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." [John 20. 29.]

CREDENTIALS OF CLERGY.

In the third place, I desire to know of our author what miraculous credentials the Jewish priests had under the second temple, or the Scribes and Pharisees, who sate in Moses' chair in our Saviour's time? Both these orders of men were as destitute of miracles, and as wicked too, as any Christian priests our author can delight to shew; and yet after so many ages and vicissitudes, our Lord sent the people with their offerings to the former, and bid them observe what the latter bid them do, though they taught the old law, the law of Moses, without miracles to vouch their authorities, as we now teach the law of Christ. Wherefore, as the magistrates of any town corporate, made a corporation five or six hundred years ago, pretend to act by the same commission, which their first predecessors received from the crown, though it may be they have not all their credentials to shew, as the first ensigns of honour and power, and are destitute of many other solemnities, by which the authority of the first magistrates was publicly notified to the people; so we now pretend to the same mission and commission that Christ gave the Apostles, and the Apostles gave to their next successors, and they to theirs, though we have not the same credentials of miracles, which, not for ever, but only for some time, were necessary to notify and prove the mission and doctrines of the Apostles, and of those they ordained, and their power and authority, not only to gather, constitute, and govern Churches, but, as Christians everywhere believed, by successive ordinations to leave the same power to others, to govern the Church of God in all places unto the end of the world. [Matt. 8. 4; 23. 2.]

Also in those early times of the Church, while Christianity was in its infant state, God gave the credentials of miracles to all believers of both sexes, to convince unbelievers of the truth of the Christian religion; and therefore by requiring miracles of the clergy now for a proof of their mission this

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVI.

man hath taught atheists, theists, and sceptics of all sorts to demand of Christians in general the same proof of their religion; and I cannot but think from the nature of his objection against our mission, which he makes openly, that he makes the same in his heart against the religion which we teach. After objecting the want of miracles to justify our commission, he asks, "What gospel never [before] known to the world we are to discover?" This is a question[o] as full of folly as malice, and in truth not worthy of an answer; and I should scarce have taken notice of it, but that it hath been asked by some, since he published his book, who hate the clergy as much as himself, and I shall give the same answer to it; That as long as there are new generations of men succeeding one another, so long it will be needful to have the same order of men, who taught the gospel from the beginning, to keep up and continue the knowledge of it in all countries where it is known, and to discover it to countries where it was never known, that all the kingdoms of the earth may become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ.

SECT. XVII. Unfair citations.

I have now said much more in answer to the Rights of the Christian Church, than at first I intended. But before I take leave of this Vatinius of priests and priesthood, I think myself obliged by some examples to detect his false and fraudulent citations, that the world may farther see, what kind of men they are, who thus set up themselves against the ecclesiastical orders, and the spiritual power of the Church.

In p. 338, he cites Eutychius, whose authority Mr. Selden made use of before him[p], to prove that the Alexandrian Church

[o] Bishop Stillingfleet, in his excellent 'Sermon preached at a public Ordination,' [held by the bishop of London at St. Peter's, Cornhill, March 15, 1684-5,] in answer to this objection writes thus, "If Christ appointed preachers only for the conversion of infidels, this argument would have great force; but the Apostle tells us that Christ hath appointed in His Church, not only Apostles and Evangelists, but 'pastors and teachers, for the perfecting,' &c... Therefore as long as the Church is in its imperfect state, as long as it may want unity, or knowledge, or improvement, this office of teachers is to continue... Can any think such a work to be now unnecessary, as long as men have consciences to be awakened, errors to be confuted, vices to be reformed, &c... While the souls of those under our care are in such perpetual danger, &c. When should pilots, &c. Is it time then to say there is no need of pilots now,.. for the ship will steer itself well enough, and the mariners cannot fail of their duty, as long as the coasts are known, and the rocks have been discovered to them." —[Works, vol. i. pp. 366, 367.]

[p] [Eutychius Batricides, Patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 933—950. He wrote a Collection of Annals, from the creation to the year 940, in Arabic.

for the first two hundred and thirty-five years had no bishops, but such as were ordained by imposition of the hands of the presbyters only. There never was a falsity more effectually, or more often refuted, at home or abroad, than this. As first by Abr. Ecchellensis at Rome[q], in his learned work cited in the margin. Secondly, by Morinus in the seventh chapter of the third part of his learned book[r] *De sacris Ecclesiæ ordinationibus.* I have cited Ecchellensis before Morinus, because he wrote to him to know his opinion of Selden's *Origines Ecclesiæ Alexandrinæ;* in answer to which letter[s], as afterwards in his book, he shewed how falsely and fallaciously Selden had translated Eutychius by, *in provinciis Egypti,* for, *in provincia Egypti,* and by, *et primus fuit hic patriarcha Alexandrinus, qui episcopos fecit,* instead of[t], *et est primus*

A few pages of this work, relating to the Church of Alexandria, were published by Selden, with a Latin translation and notes, in 1642. The title was, Eutychii Ægyptii Patriarchæ Orthodoxorum Alexandrini Ecclesiæ suæ Origines, ex ejusdem Arabico, nunc primum typis edidit ac versione et commentario auxit Joannes Seldenus. 4to. It will be found in his works, fol. 1726, tom. ii. pars i. p. 410. At Selden's request and at his cost, Pocock undertook to translate and publish the whole work, which came out at Oxford after Selden's death, in 4to. 1656, with the title, "Contextio Gemmarum, (which was the name Eutychius had given it,) sive Eutychii Patriarchæ Alexandrini Annales." To this edition, p. 328, Tindal refers. The passage alleged by him and by Selden, against the power of ordination being confined to bishops, is, "Constituit autem evangelista Marcus, una cum Hanania patriarcha, duodecim presbyteros, qui nempe cum patriarcha manerent, adeo ut cum vacaret patriarchatus, unum e duodecim presbyteris eligerent, cujus capiti reliqui undecim manus imponentes ipsi benedicerent et patriarcham crearent ... neque desiit Alexandriæ institutum hoc de presbyteris, ut scilicet patriarchas crearent ex presbyteris duodecim, usque ad tempora Alexandri patriarchæ Alexandrini, qui fuit ex illo numero trecentorum et octodecim (scil. in Concil. Nicæn.) Is autem vetuit ne deinceps patriarcham presbyteri crearent. Et decrevit ut mortuo patriarcha convenirent episcopi qui patriarcham ordinarent."

Tindal also referred to a passage in St. Jerome, (ad Evangelum, Ep. lxxxv. Op., tom. i. p. 1076, B.) which is involved in this discussion. "Nam et Alexandriæ a Marco Evangelista, usque ad Heradam et Dionysium Episcopos, presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum episcopum nominabant: quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciat," &c.]

[q] Eutychius vindicatus, sive responsio ad Johannis Seldeni Origines Alexandrinas. Authore Abrahamo Ecchellensi, Maronita e Libano, Romæ typis S. Congr. de Prop. Fide. 1661. [Ecchellensis shews that Selden had mistranslated Eutychius, and proves very fully that the statements he makes must be supposed to refer to the election, not the consecration, of the patriarch: and that Eutychius himself contradicts Selden's inferences. The other writers referred to below shew the inconsistency of Eutychius' statement with other history, and treat his work as of little authority. See to the same effect Cave, Hist. Lit., tom. ii. p. 931.]

[r] [Commentarius de Sacris Ecclesiæ ordinationibus ... auctore Joanne Morino. Pars iii. Exercitatio vii. de Presbyteris, cap. vii. p. 121. Antw. 1695.]

[s] [See Morinus, ibid., § xiii. p. 123, and Antiquitates Ecclesiæ Orientalis, Barberini et aliorum dissertationibus epistolicis enucleatæ, p. 463. London, 1682; where the letter is given in full, Epist. lxxxv. p. 449.]

[t] "i. e. Demetrius est primus pa-

patriarcha, qui in Alexandria fecit episcopos. And there are more such instances of Mr. Selden's ingenuity in Ecchellensis' answer to his book. Thirdly, this falsity hath been convicted by two learned men of our country, Dr. Hammond, and Bishop Pearson. By the former in the tenth chapter of his third dissertation against Blondel[u], to which Daillè never made any reply; and by the latter in the tenth and eleventh chapters of the former part of his Vindiciæ Epist. S. Ignatii, first printed at Cambridge 1672, and since by Le Clerc, at Antwerp, 1700[x]. [See also what is written by Eusebius Renaudotius in his late work intitled "Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum," &c., lately printed at Paris, 1713; wherein, p. 7, 8, 11, 19, 54, Selden is justly and severely chastised for what he wrote upon a fragment out of Eutychius, and also clearly refuted[y].] I mention all these answers to Selden's Eutychius, and the several editions of Bishop Pearson's Vindiciæ, to shew that our author could not be ignorant of some of them; and if he were not, what hath he to answer to God, and honest men, for citing a book so miserably baffled, especially by Bishop Pearson, whose vindication of Ignatius's epistles is, and ever will be a defence of the Church against all such books, which he, and his accomplices can write.

In p. xxxvii. of his Preface, to prove that the bishops of the Reformation disowned all independent power[z], he cites the

triarcha, qui in Ægypto proprie dicta, sibi immediate subjecta, Episcopos creavit." [The passage in Selden's Latin translation, p. 422, is as follows, "Sed vero ab Hanania, quem constituit Marcus evangelista patriarcham Alexandriæ, usque in tempora Demetrii patriarchæ ibidem (is patriarcha fuit Alexandrinus undecimus) nullus erat in provinciis Ægypti episcopus; nec patriarchæ ante eum crearunt episcopos. Ille autem factus patriarcha tres constituit episcopos. Et primus fuit hic patriarcha Alexandrinus, qui episcopos fecit."]

[u] [Dissertationes quatuor, quibus episcopatus jura ex S. Scripturis et primæva antiquitate astruuntur contra sententiam D. Blondelli et aliorum. 1651. It is contained in Hammond's collected works, vol. iv. p. 792.]

[x] [Et ad calcem Patr. Apost. edit. 2. Amst. 1724. tom. ii. pp. 334, 338—345. The passage in Eutychius was alleged as an argument against the genuineness of St. Ignatius's epistles; as though the principle of 'doing nothing without the bishop' was unknown in the primitive Church of Alexandria.]

[y] [MS. addition in Hickes' copy.]

[z] [The words of the act are, "Where the king's humble and obedient subjects the clergy of this realm of England, have not only knowledged according to the truth, that the convocation of the same clergy are, always have been, and ought to be assembled by the king's writ, but also submitting themselves to the king's majesty, have promised in verbo sacerdotii, that they will never from henceforth presume to attempt, allege, claim, or put in ure; or enact, promulge, or execute any new canons, constitutions, ordinances provincial, or other, or by whatsoever other name they shall be called, in the

UNFAIR CITATIONS.

25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, and saith, that it was "enacted at the request of the clergy, and penned in the very words of their petition;" and "there can be no greater argument (saith he) of their disowning all independent power." Here are several artifices in this citation; as first to cite, as popish writers are wont to do, the bishops who made their submission to Henry VIII. as bishops of the Reformation, though in their grant to the king of £100,000 for the release of the præmunire[a], they complimented his majesty greatly for writing against the enemies of the papal Church, particularly against Luther[b]. Secondly, in saying it was enacted at

convocation, unless the king's majesty do give his most royal assent and authority in that behalf; and where divers constitutions, &c., which heretofore have been enacted be thought, &c. . . . The said clergy hath most humbly besought the king's highness that the said constitutions and canons may be committed to the examination and judgment of his highness, and of two and thirty persons of the king's subjects; whereof sixteen to be of the upper and nether house of the parliament, and other sixteen to be of the clergy of this realm; and all the said two and thirty persons to be chosen and appointed by the king's majesty: and that such of the said constitutions and canons as should be thought and determined by the said two and thirty persons, or the more part of them, worthy to be abrogated and annulled, shall be abolite and made of no value accordingly, &c. Be it now therefore enacted, by the authority of this present parliament, according to the said submission and petition of the said clergy, that they ne any of them from henceforth shall presume," &c. as above, "upon pain of every one of the said clergy doing contrary to this act, and being thereof convict, to suffer imprisonment, and make fine at the king's will.

"And forasmuch as such canons, &c., as have heretofore been made . . . cannot now (at the session of this present parliament, by reason of shortness of time) be viewed, examined, &c. . . . according to the petition of the said clergy, in form before rehearsed. Be it therefore enacted, by authority aforesaid, that the king's highness shall have power and authority to nominate and assign at his pleasure the said two and thirty persons," &c.

It will be observed that the word "petition" refers only to the appointment of a commission to revise the canons; the other is distinguished from it as being a submission.]

[a] [It is with this circumstance that Atterbury begins his history of the submission of the clergy (p. 80.) "Henry VIII. for the better accomplishing his design of lessening the papal authority, which could not well be accomplished without striking a terror into the clergy, involved them all in a præmunire," (rendering them liable to forfeiture of goods and imprisonment,) "for submitting to Wolsey's legatine character, unauthorized by the crown" (though they were in ignorance of that fact.) . . . "Thus, (p. 81.) all the clergy and a good part of the laity were unawares at the king's mercy, and the clergy not admitted to pardon gratis (as the laity afterwards were); but forced to ransom themselves by a good round sum for those times, (£100,000 for the province of Canterbury, and £18,840. 0s. 10d. for that of York,) and by solemn recognition of the king's supreme headship, in the preamble of the instrument by which the grant was made."] See "The Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English convocation," by Dr. Atterbury, second edition, 1701; [and the document in his Appendix,] p. 514.

[b] [The submission was made May 16, 1532. The grant of £100,000, in which the king's supremacy was most unwillingly and with qualification acknowledged, had been made Jan. 24, 1530, Abp. Warham being still designated "Apostolicæ sedis legatus." The words of "compliment" and recognition of the supremacy are, speaking of the king, "Sic impræsens hostes, maxime

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVII.

their request; for it was not enacted "till near two years after they made their submission[c]. Till that time," saith my author, "it bound them, as their own act and promise only; without any penalty annexed to the breach of it; and it might have been questioned, whether this promise was not personal, and did not die with the makers of it. But in March 1533, a statute passed which perpetuated the submission, and obliged all their successors under pain of præmunire [to stand to the terms of it]." To this I must add what the same author (who hath given an accurate account of the clergy's submission, and of the first step to it in their recognition of the king's supremacy) saith in another place[d]: "In no submission of theirs are there any words, which expressly and in terms, bind the future clergy; and, had this act of theirs extended to their successors, yet all they did in Henry the Eighth's reign, was undone again by them in the reign of Queen Mary; when the clergy [assembled] in convocation [complained] of the statute of submission, petitioned for a repeal of it[e], and obtained it[f]. And though it was revived afterwards, 1 Eliz. [cap. 1.] yet was not that revival at the instance, or with the express consent of the clergy; and they stand bound, therefore, at present, by no act of their own, but by the temporal law only." This shews that that act was neither at first made, nor afterwards revived at the request of the clergy; and then it can be no "argument of their disowning an independent power;" but only of their choosing all along to

Lutheranos in perniciem ecclesiæ et cleri Anglicani (cujus singularem protectorem unicum et supremum dominum, et quantum per Christi legem licet, etiam supremum caput ipsius majestatem recognoscimus) conspirantes .... sapientissima ejus majestas, ut decebat pium fidei et ecclesiæ defensorem, suis laboribus, studio, rationibus et consilio, contudit et repressit."—Ibid., Appendix, p. 514, and Wilkins' Concilia, tom. iii. p. 742.]

[c] Atterbury, ibid., p. 95. [The submission was made as above, May 16, 1532, the statute enacted March, 1533-4. For the error of Tindal as to its being at the request of the clergy, see end of note z, in the last page.]

[d] Atterbury, ibid., p. 98.

[e] [Dec. 7, 1554, Petition of the lower house of convocation to the bishops.

"7. That the ancient liberty, authority, and jurisdiction be restored to the Church of England according to the article of the great charter called Magna Charta, at the least wise in such sort as it was in the first year of Henry VIII... 10. That the statute of the submission of the clergy made anno 25. Hen. VIII., and all other statutes made during the time of the late schism, in derogation of the liberties and jurisdiction of the Church, from the first year of King Henry VIII., may be repealed, and the Church restored in integrum."—Wilkins' Concilia, tom. iv. p. 95, and Burnet's Reformation; Records, vol. ii. p. 266. fol.]

[f] [By the act 1 Mar. c. 1.]

submit to the act, rather than to "throw themselves into a persecution." Furthermore, the aforesaid act of 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, was so far from being made at their request, that their act of submission, whose words it recites, was obtained, or rather extorted, with great difficulty from them, as appears by the regular and exact account of it in the said book[g], more especially from their several replies to the "sup-

UNFAIR CITATIONS.

[g] Atterbury, ibid., pp. 86—99. [p. 86. "Two things stood in the way of the king's designs, the old papal constitutions and the clergy's power of making new ones. To remove these the commons were made use of, who in the latter end of the year 1531 put up a long supplication to the king against the ordinaries; and therein complained, first, of the body of ecclesiastical laws then in force, ... and next, of the privilege which the clergy claimed, of enacting canons by their own sole authority, without consent of the crown; a privilege beyond what the parliament itself ever pretended to.... So much of it as relates to our present subject is almost in terms recited in the reply which the clergy gave to it when the convocation met, after a short recess, on April 12, 1532, which reply I shall give the reader at length." (In his Appendix, No. VI. pp. 521, sqq. It is given in Wilkins, tom. iii. p. 750.) "In it they professed a readiness to comply with any reasonable offer that should be made for reforming the ecclesiastical laws, but however asserted the validity of the old canons, and their own power to make new ones independently of the civil authority. ... The king was displeased both with this answer and the drawer of it, (Bishop Gardiner,) and he remitted it therefore back again to the convocation to be better considered of by them." A second answer was drawn up by a committee of the lower house and agreed to by the upper, (Wednesday, May 8,) ... in it they promise "for the new, which they should hereafter make, to suspend them when made, from time to time, till the king should give his consent and authority to them; for the old,... if any of them should be found to be of such dangerous import as was pretended, they engage to revoke and annul them."—Appendix, p. 530, and Wilkins, tom. iii. p. 753. This was laid before the king; and on the following Friday, May 10, they were informed by Edward Fox, the king's almoner, afterwards bishop of Hereford, (see above p. 162,) how little satisfaction their answer had given, and a form was produced "which the king required them peremptorily to sign, and without which he would not be contented."—(p. 89.) The articles follow, (see Wilkins, tom. iii. p. 749.) "Upon receiving this paper the clergy adjourned first to St. Catherine's, and then to St. Dunstan's chapel in the monastery," and sent a deputation of the two houses to Fisher, bishop of Rochester, for his advice, and adjourned till Monday. The king meanwhile sent for the speaker of the House of Commons, and "by him informed the house of the oath which the bishops and abbots took to the pope; by which it appeared that they were but half subjects to himself; and leaving it to them to improve this intimation in what way they thought fitting, and to reduce the clergy to as entire an obedience to the crown of England as the laity paid."—p. 91.

"This wrought so effectually, that when the clergy met again on Monday, the bishops' house came quite up to the king's terms, upon the first article, ... which the lower house assented to, on condition that the promise might take place for the king's life only. But upon the second article, neither of them could be brought any farther than to refer all the old canons to the king's examination and authority alone, and to promise, by their own authority, to moderate or annul what he should disapprove; but with such a general saving in the close of this promise as left it still in their power which of them they would keep, and which they would part with."—p. 91.

This is the particular passage referred to by Hickes. The document is given in Atterbury's Appendix, p. 534, with the variations of three copies, and one of them is in Wilkins, tom. iii. p. 752. It may be noticed that these papers are not arranged by Wilkins in the order of

plication of the Commons;" and that they never intended to disown their independent power, which before they had exercised, is plain from their last form of submission[h], in which they made their promises in trust and confidence to the king: "we your majesty's humble subjects, [daily orators and beadsmen of your clergy of England,] having our trust and confidence in your excellent wisdom, your princely goodness, and fervent zeal, [to the promotion of God's honour and Christian religion,] and also in your learning far exceeding [in our judgment the learning of all other kings and princes that we have read of,] and doubting nothing, but that the same shall still continue, and daily increase in your majesty; first do offer and promise," &c.

So also their recognition of the king's supremacy was not absolute, as the statute 26 Hen. VIII. c. 1. represents it to be[i], but conditional, with this limitation[k]; *Cujus*[l] *singularem protectorem, unicum et supremum dominum, et quantum per Christi legem licet, etiam supremum caput, ipsius Majestatem recognoscimus.* With this clause of restriction the learned Dr. Fisher[m], bishop of Rochester, signed it, who afterwards,

this history. The king was indignant at the opposition of the clergy, and next demanded that they should not "presume to allege, claim, or put in ure" any canons, &c., omitting the word new, thereby taking away the jurisdiction as well as legislative power of the Church. This "they absolutely refused to submit to," and ultimately that point was withdrawn, and they submitted in the terms recited in the preamble and the act 25 Hen. c. 19. See above, note z, pp. 222, 223.]

[h] Atterbury, ibid., Appendix, p. 537. [Wilkins' Concilia, tom. iii. p. 754.]

[i] Ibid., p. 514.

[k] [The words of the act are, "Albeit the king's majesty justly and rightfully is and ought to be the supreme head of the Church of England, and so is recognized by the clergy of this realm in their convocation, yet nevertheless," &c. 26 Hen. VIII. c. 1. (1534.)]

[l] [This "was not without great difficulty extorted from them; the debates of convocation being wholly taken up with it, for five days together: in most of which the two houses sat from morning till evening. And during this time at least seven or eight menacing messages were sent to them from the king by the great men of the law, or by some of his privy councillors and nobles.

"At first, his new title was proposed to them" (from the king, as a necessary condition of their grant for the release of the præmunire, see note a, p. 223) "in these terms, 'Ecclesiæ et cleri Anglicani, cujus protector, et supremum caput is solus est.' But this would by no means be admitted.... After three days, the king finding them obstinate, was prevailed with to soften these harsh terms with the addition of 'post Deum,' after the word 'caput;' but neither would this form pass, the clergy being determined to hazard all rather than comply with it. So, on February 11, the archbishop brought in a further qualification of it, letting them know the king was contented it should run, 'Ecclesiæ et cleri Anglicani, cujus singularem protectorem, unicum et supremum [dominum, et quantum per Christi legem licet, etiam supremum] caput, ipsius majestatem recognoscimus;' and with this salvo it was reluctantly passed."—Atterbury, ibid., pp. 82—84.]

[m] Ibid., p. 84. marg. [The nine bishops who were then present in the upper house, and subscribed, were, Warham of Canterbury, Stokesly of

UNFAIR CITATIONS.

when he saw in what a boasting and boundless manner the king exercised his new supremacy, denied it, for which with great cheerfulness and satisfaction, as Sir Thomas More afterwards did, he suffered death[n].

The bishop of Sarum, in his History of the Reformation[o], observes that the 'supremacy was not a point of state, but a matter of conscience.' And in his Reflections on the Relation of the English Reformation[p] [lately printed at Oxford,] printed [at Amsterdam] 1688, he hath said many things of it, and the submission of the clergy, to which I refer our author for an answer to his preface, in which, if a man may judge by his way of writing, he surely thinks he hath confounded the legislation and jurisdiction of the Church of England, as a spiritual society, with the statutes relating to those two points. The bishop is a writer of great authority with him; he cites and adorns him very often, and therefore I hope he will take great notice of what I am going to present him out of his Reflections[q], as well as because they were written against a clandestine papist, O. W.[r], with whom

London, Geof. Blythe of Lichfield and Coventry, Fisher of Rochester, Nic. West of Ely, John Voysey of Exeter, Longland of Lincoln, Hen. Standish of St. Asaph, and John Clerk of Bath and Wells.]

[n] [Fisher was beheaded as guilty of high treason, in denying the king to be supreme head of the Church, June 22, 1535, and Sir Thomas More July 6th of the same year.]

[o] Vol. i. book iii. p. 354. [Burnet's words are, speaking of Fisher, "Many thought the king ought to have proceeded against him rather upon that, (the business of the maid of Kent,) which was a point of state, than upon the supremacy, which was matter of conscience."]

[p] [The title of this work is, "Church Government, part v. A Relation of the English Reformation, and the lawfulness thereof, examined by the theses delivered in the four former parts." It was written, not, as Hickes seems to imply, by Obadiah Walker, but by Abraham Woodhead, his former tutor and intimate friend. Woodhead was living in seclusion, and his works were printed by Walker, and several of them in consequence were attributed to him. Indeed Burnet, who was then in Holland, as chaplain to the princess of Orange, supposed the same, for his Reflections begin, (p. 1,) "We have been long in expectation of some extraordinary production of the eminent convert of Oxford. His age, his learning, and the present conjuncture, hath raised this expectation very high." This was the first book printed at University college, at the private press which Walker established in his lodgings, on discovering that the sheets of the works, which he printed at the Theatre, under a licence from James II., dated May, 1686, (for which see Gutch's Collectanea, vol. i. p. 288,) were shewn to his opponents. It bears the head of King Alfred on the title-page, as do others printed at the same press.]

[q] [Reflections, &c., p. 12.]

[r] Mr. Obadiah Walker. [Master of University college; with whom it is probable that Tindal's history is intimately connected. Hickes was not in Oxford at the period now referred to: he had heard of Tindal's "conversing" with Walker; and this intercourse agrees with Tindal's own account, that he had been influenced by the 'Roman emissaries who were then busy in the University.' See Second Defence of Rights, p. 172, and note a, p. 48. There

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVII.

the author of the Rights is said to have conversed much, and it may be sucked the venom from him, which he hath been spitting upon the Church of England from that time to this[s].

I begin with the third chapter, which hath this title: "Some general considerations on the regal supremacy, that was raised so high at the Reformation."

"Our author hath brought together many acts of parliament with their pompous preambles, that seem to carry the king's power in ecclesiastical matters to a very indefinite degree, and upon all this he triumphs often, as if this was so improper, that it alone is enough to blast the whole Reformation.

"Our author is much more concerned to justify all papal bulls, than we can be to justify all the words of our laws; especially the rhetoric that is in their preambles. If he believes the pope infallible, the general parts of bulls that set forth the doctrine of the Church, are such solemn declarations, that he must be determined by them. But at lowest he believes the popes to be the centres of the catholic unity, and all bishops are bound by oath to obey all their decrees and ordinances. Now when our author will undertake to justify all the preambles of bulls that are in the Bullarium, then we may undertake to justify all the flourishes that may be in any act of parliament.

"When any authority is asserted in general and indefinite terms, these are always to be understood with those restrictions and limitations that the nature of things require to be supposed, even when they are not expressed. St. Paul expresses the obedience of wives to their husbands in terms so
Eph. 5. 24. extremely extended, that as 'the Church is subject unto Christ, so ought the wives be to their own husbands in every thing.' He expresses also the duty of children in as com-
Col. 3. 20. prehensive terms. 'Children obey your parents in all things.' Now if one would draw inferences from the extent of these words, he might, taking the liberty that our author takes upon some of the expressions that are in our acts of parlia-

seems no ground to suppose that Walker was, strictly speaking, a "clandestine Papist," that is, that he was actually in communion with the Church of Rome, before he openly joined it in January 1685-6. After that time he had a chapel and mass said in part of his college, which was attended by some scholars. Tindal went over in Jan. 1686-7.]

[s] [See note a, p. 48.]

UNFAIR CITATIONS.

ment, represent the authority that St. Paul vests both in husbands and parents, as a very boundless and a very extravagant thing. This is enough to shew that in all those large phrases of obedience, there are some necessary reserves and exceptions to be understood; and if this qualification is necessary, even in writings that were inspired, it is no wonder if some of the rhetoric of our acts of parliament wants a little of this correction.

"It is a very unreasonable thing to urge some general expressions, or some stretches of the royal supremacy, and not to consider that more strict explanation that was made of it, both in King Henry the Eighth's time, and under Queen Elizabeth; that were so clear, that if we had to do with men that had not resolved beforehand not to be satisfied, one would think there could be no room for any farther cavilling. In King Henry's time the extent of the king's supremacy was defined in The Necessary Erudition of a Christian man[t], that was set forth as the standard of the doctrine of that time; and it was upon this that all people were obliged to take their measures, and not upon some expressions either in acts of parliament, or acts of the convocation, nor upon some stretches of the king's jurisdiction. In this then it is plainly said, that with relation to the clergy the king is to 'oversee them, and to cause that they execute their pastoral office truly and faithfully, and especially in those points which by Christ and His Apostles was committed to them.' And to this it is added, 'that bishops and priests are bound to obey all the king's laws, not being contrary to the laws of God.' So that here is expressed that necessary reserve upon their obedience; it being provided, that they were only bound to obey when the laws were not contrary to the laws of God. The other reserve is also made of all that authority which was committed by Christ and His Apostles to the bishops and priests; and we are not ashamed to own it freely, that we see no other reserves upon our obedience to the king besides these; so that these being here specified, there was an unexceptionable declaration made of the extent of the king's supremacy; yet because the term, Head of the Church,

[t] [A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian man, &c. 1543. p. 287, Oxford, 1825.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVII.

had something in it that seemed harsh, there was yet a more express declaration made of this matter, under Queen Elizabeth, of which indeed our author hath taken notice; though I do not find he takes notice of the former, which he ought to have done, if he had intended to have represented this matter sincerely to the world (which I confess seems not to have troubled him much.) The explanation made by Queen Elizabeth is so express that even our author cannot find any advantage against the words themselves, but acknowledges that they are such general terms that the article itself may be subscribed by all sides[u]. Since then the declared sense of those general and extended expressions that are in some acts of parliament, is such, that there lies no just exception against it; and since this sense was not only given by Queen Elizabeth, who allowed such as took the oath to declare that they took it in that sense; but it was afterwards enacted both in convocation, and in parliament[x], and put into the body of our confession of faith; this explanation must be considered as the true measure of the king's supremacy; and the wide expressions in the former laws must be understood to be restrained by this, since posterior laws derogate from those that were at first made. So that according to all this, the king's supremacy doth not 'give to our princes the ministering either of God's word or of the Sacraments.... But that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in holy Scriptures by God Himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and the evil-doers.' This is all that supremacy which we are bound in conscience to own; and if the letter of the law, or the stretches of that in the

[u] [Relation of the English Reformation,] pp. 87, 88. ["This part of the article (art. 37.) is couched in such general terms, as that it will be subscribed to by all sides: Fr. a S. Clara, (Expos. of the 39 Articles) alloweth it: and saith also, 'Hic articulus a Gallis et parliamento Parisiensi, salva communione Ecclesiæ, usurpatur.'" The following words, referred to in the article as "the Injunctions lately set forth by Elizabeth our queen," are intended by "the explanation made by Queen Elizabeth," mentioned in the text; "Her majesty doth not challenge any other authority, than, under God, to have that that was challenged, &c., that is, under God to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons within these realms, whether ecclesiastical or temporal, so as no other sovereign power shall or ought to have dominion over them."—Quoted ibid., p. 85.]

[x] [Act of 1 Eliz. c. 1.]

UNFAIR CITATIONS.

administration of it, have carried this farther, we are not at all concerned in it; but in case any such thing were made out, it could amount to no more than this, that the civil power had made some encroachments on ecclesiastical authority; but the submitting to an oppression, and the bearing it till some better times may deliver us from it, is no argument against our Church; on the contrary, it is a proof of our temper and patience, and of that respect we pay to that civil authority which God hath set over us, even when we think that it passeth its bounds. But all that we are bound to acknowledge in the king's supremacy, is so well limited, that our author hath nothing to object to it."

"So that[y] upon the whole matter, if the great and unmeasured extent of the papal authority made our princes judge it necessary to secure themselves from those invasions, by stretching their jurisdiction a little too much; on the other hand, those who have submitted so tamely to the one, have no reason to reproach us for bearing the other, servitude, even supposing that we granted that to be the case. And if in the time of our Reformation, some of our bishops or other writers have carried the royal supremacy too far, either in acts of convocation or in their writings, as those things are personal matters, in which we are not at all concerned, who do not pretend to assert an infallibility in our Church; so their excess in this was a thing so natural, that we have all possible reason to excuse it, or at least to censure it very gently. For as all parties and persons are carried by a bias very common to mankind, to magnify that authority which favours and supports them; so the extremes of the papal tyranny, and the ecclesiastical power that had formerly prevailed, might have carried them a little too far into the opposite extreme, of raising the civil power too high."

"Upon which[z] he [Woodhead] argues [arraigns] two things,

[y] Burnet, Reflections, &c. p. 16.

[z] [That is, the first two theses laid down in the Relation, (as abridged by Burnet, p. 18.) The "first is, The two principal offices which the clergy have received from Christ are, (1.) to determine controversies in pure matters of religion, and to judge what is truth and what are errors in faith and worship. (2.) To teach and promulgate this truth, and to execute Church censures on those who receive it not. The second is, That the clergy cannot make over this authority to the secular governor, being charged by Christ to execute it to the end of the world."—See Relation, pp. 2, 11. The passage in the text follows in Burnet; the words in the Relation are, "From which it follows that the clergy's doing either

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVII.

'(1.) The clergy's binding themselves never to make any decisions in matters of faith or worship, till they had first obtained the consent of the secular governor. (2.) The clergy's authorizing the secular governor, or those whom he should nominate, to determine those matters in their stead[a].'

"It is certain, no clergy in the world can make any such deputation; and if any have done it, it was a personal act of theirs, which was null of itself, and did not indeed bind those who made it, it being of its own nature unlawful, but much less can it bind their successors."

To these passages I think fit to add what his lordship hath said of the prince's power to depose the clergy, because the Rights[b] hath as it were marshalled up the depriving acts in battle-array against them, and frequently reproached them with suspension, deprivation, and incapacity by and from the civil power.

"The third thesis is[c], 'that the prince cannot depose any of his clergy, without the consent of the major part of the clergy, or their ecclesiastical superiors, and in particular of the patriarch.'

"In this the matter must still be reduced to the former point; either the grounds of such a deposition are in themselves just, or not; if they are just, the prince may as lawfully hinder any church-man from corrupting his subjects, while he is supported by a public authority or a settled revenue, as he may hinder a man that hath the plague on him from going about to infect his people; for his deposing such a one is only the taking the civil encouragement from him; but when this is done unjustly, it is without doubt an act of high oppression in the prince; and as for the person deposed, and those over whom he was set, they are to consider according to the rules of prudence, whether the present case is of such importance, that it will balance the inconveniences of their throwing themselves into a state of persecution; for it is to be confessed that church-men have by their office an indefinite authority of feeding the flock, which cannot be dissolved by any act of the prince's; but the appropriating

of these things," binding themselves, &c. . . . "I say these two things are unlawful."—Ibid., pp. 11, 12.]

[a] [The passage is from the Relation, p. 11.]

[b] Pref., pp. xxx, xxxi.

[c] [Burnet, Reflections, p. 20. The thesis occurs at p. 12. of the Relation.]

UNFAIR CITATIONS.

this to such a precinct, and the supporting it by civil encouragements, [it] is a human thing, and is therefore subject to the sovereign power." But of what he said in the last four lines I shall say no more here, than that I think they seem to call for his lordship's second thoughts and farther explication.

In p. 107 he most impudently, as well as falsely, cites Tertullian *De Corona Militis*[d], to prove that receiving the Eucharist from the hand of the bishop was 'an innovation,' whereas the contrary is most evident from the father's words, which are these: *Eucharistiæ Sacramentum, et in tempore victus, et omnibus mandatum a Domino, etiam antelucanis cœtibus, nec de aliorum manu quam præsidentium sumimus.* "We receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist commanded by the Lord to be received at the time of (our love feast) meals (in the evening) and at all times[e], in our (morning) assemblies before day, but we receive it from the hands of none but of the bishops."

The next citation in which I tax him of want of ingenuity, and fraud, is that in which he puts Bishop Bull with Petavius, Curcellæus, Cudworth, and Le Clerc, to prove that the doctrine of the Nicene "fathers was not that there is only one Divine essence in number, but in kind[f]." He might with as much modesty, truth, and ingenuity, have named this great defender of the Nicene faith and fathers with Socinus, Epi-

[d] cap. iii. [Tert. Op., p. 102, A.]

[e] [Tindal (Rights, p. 107.) translated the words 'omnibus mandatum,' "committed to all." The passage seems to mean, "the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which was enjoined by the Lord, both at the time of a meal and to all, we receive in meetings before dawn," and of course fasting, ('ante omnem cibum,' as he says, Ad Uxorem, lib. ii. c. 5. Op., p. 169, A.) "and only at the hands of those who preside." Tertullian is arguing that traditionary practices are to be observed, though not contained in Scripture, nay even when they seem, as in this instance, to oppose it; not meaning that the Church practice was "an innovation," as Tindal says, but that the practice of His Church from the first evidenced the intention of our Lord, and determined the sense of Scripture.]

[f] ["To which may be added that the doctrine of those fathers was not, that there is only one Divine essence in number, but only in kind; as is more evident from Petavius, Curcellæus, Cudworth, Le Clerc, Dr. Bull, and several others."—Rights, pp. 196, 197. For the opinions of the first three of these persons see Nelson's Life of Bull, pp. 243—250, and 289, sqq. Oxford, 1827. What he says of Petavius is, that he "had been at prodigious pains in collecting all that the Christian writers have said both before and after that (the Nicene) council upon this subject: but after all . . . some even suspected the author to be himself all the while no better than a covert Arian, and to have written, even on purpose, to betray the cause for which he appeared; than which nothing can be more false; as any one may soon convince himself who will be but at the pains to examine what he hath written."]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVII.

scopius, and Sandius, against whom he hath written, as well as against Petavius, by name, as may be seen in the *Proœmium* of his *Defensio fidei Nicenæ*[g], as well as in his *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*[h], which he wrote on purpose against Episcopius, of whom he gives this character in the *Proœmium* to his *Defensio*[i], &c. *Simon Episcopius theologus cætera doctissimus, sed in antiquitate ecclesiastica plane hospes.* To which I must add what he saith of Episcopius' censure of the council of Nice, and the other councils which maintained the Nicene confession, "that they were led on by fury, faction, and madness:" *Quis vero, inquam ego*[k], &c. "But who, say I, doth not perceive that these things must proceed from a mind which is not so sound or so composed as it ought to be? For how could it become a sober and a modest man thus to tear and rend with slanders the venerable prelates of the most august synod? But now to the matter. He is not ashamed to say, that the Nicene creed was made in a heat, by the fury and the factiousness of a party, without sense or any consideration. But the emperor Constantine, who presided in the said synod of Nice, expressly testifieth, in an epistle to the Churches concerning the same council, that he being himself present in it, all matters were therein discussed with all due examination. The same emperor, in an epistle to the Church of Alexandria in particular, which is found in the Ecclesiastical His-

[g] [See of Socinus, Def. Fid. Nic. Procem. § 4. p. 5; Episcopius, § 5. pp. 6—9; Sandius, § 6. p. 9; Petavius, § 7. sqq. pp. 9—13; Bull's Works, vol. v. Oxford, 1827.]

[h] [See the Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ; Præmon. ad Lectorem, and Introduction, ibid., vol. vi. pp. 5—13.]

[i] [Def. Fid. Nic. Procem., § 5. ibid., vol. v. p. 6.]

[k] Ib. [The whole passage beginning with a quotation from Episcopius (Instit. Theol. iv. 34. sect. 2.) is, "'Et si quod res est, dicendum est, ea ab episcopis inter se magna cum æmulatione jurgantibus et contendentibus, ex fervore, si non furore, partiumque studio insano ac maleferiato, præcipitata potius videri debent, quam a compositis animis profecta.' Atque ut intelligas, Nicænum præcipue symbolum ab ipso hic perstringi, mox subdit, 'Quis enim nescit quam acres in synodo Nicæna disceptationes, quam præfracta jurgia inter episcopos excitata fuerint?' Quis vero, inquam ego, non sentiat, hæc ab animo haud satis sano aut composito profecta esse? adeone decuit virum sobrium ac modestum venerandos augustissimæ synodi antistites convitiis lacerare et proscindere? Sed ad rem. Symbolum Nicænum ab episcopis, 'ex furore partiumque studio insano ac maleferiato, præcipitatum fuisse' non veretur dicere. At Constantinus imperator, qui synodo Nicænæ moderator ipse præfuit, in Epistola ad ecclesias de eadem synodo diserte testatur (apud Euseb. de Vita Constant., lib. iii. cap. 17. p. 586), quod se præsente in ea ἅπαντα τῆς προσηκούσης τετύχηκεν ἐξετάσεως, 'cuncta competenti examine discussa fuerint.' Idem in Epistola ad Alexandrinam ecclesiam proprie scripta ait (apud Socratem Hist. Eccles., lib. i. cap. 9. p. 30. ed. Vales.), se inter Ni-

UNFAIR CITATIONS.

tory of Socrates, says, that he himself, among the Nicene bishops, and as it were one of their number, and their fellow-servant, did, being present, so undertake the examination of the truth, as that all things which might bear a show of, or administer occasion for a doubtful or ambiguous sense, or difference of sentiments, might be accurately discussed. To which epistle of Constantine Socrates adds this remark; Ὁ μὲν δὲ βασιλεὺς, &c. 'Now the emperor wrote after this manner to the people of Alexandria, hereby teaching them that the council's definition concerning the faith was not slightly and rashly, but maturely and deliberately, after a diligent enquiry and full examination, determined; and that there was not notice taken of some arguments, and others passed by or silently suppressed, but that all whatever could be brought for the proof or disproof of the doctrine to be established, was fairly produced and canvassed openly. Neither was any thing by them simply or inconsiderately defined; but all was in the first place accurately sifted and examined into.' Nay even Eusebius himself, who seems to have had the next place in the Nicene assembly to the emperor (a writer of very great integrity, of a temperate and moderate genius, and no wise partial against the Arians), expressly relates how that all the bishops did subscribe to the faith agreed on in that council, οὐκ ἀνεξετάστως, not rashly and without consideration, but after an accurate, deliberate, and

cænos episcopos, velut ex eorum numero unum, et conservum ipsorum, præsentem veritatis examen ita suscepisse, ut ἠλέγχθη ἅπαντα, καὶ ἀκριβῶς ἐξήτασται, ὅσα ἡ ἀμφιβολίας (sic enim legendum esse, ex eadem clausula mox a Socrate repetita, satis liquet) ἢ διχονοίας πρόφασιν ἐδόκει γενναῖν, i. e. 'Cuncta, quæ controversiæ aut dissensionis materiam excitare videbantur, accurate discussa atque examinata fuerint.' Ad quam Constantini Epistolam hæc annotat Socrates (p. 31): Ὁ μὲν δὴ βασιλεὺς τοιαῦτα ἔγραφε τῷ Ἀλεξανδρέων δήμῳ, μηνύων ὅτι οὐχ' ἁπλῶς, οὐδὲ ὡς ἔτυχε γέγονεν ὁ ὅρος τῆς πίστεως· ἀλλ' ὅτι μετὰ πολλῆς συζητήσεως καὶ δοκιμασίας αὐτὸν ὑπηγόρευσαν· καὶ οὐχ' ὅτε τινὰ μὲν ἐλέχθη, τινὰ δὲ ἀπεσιγήθη, ἀλλ' ὅτε ὅσα πρὸς σύστασιν τοῦ δόγματος λεχθῆναι ἥρμοζε, πάντα ἐκινήθη· καὶ ὅτι οὐχ' ἁπλῶς ὡρίσθη, ἀλλ' ἀκριβῶς ἐξητάσθη πρότερον· i. e. 'Et imperator quidem hæc scripsit ad populum Alexandrinum, docens definitionem fidei non leviter ac temere, sed cum multa inquisitione ac diligenti examine dictatam fuisse: nec quædam in eo concilio dicta, quædam silentio tradita, sed quæcunque ad confirmationem dogmatis dici poterant, cuncta in medium fuisse prolata; nec causam temere definitam, sed prius accurate discussam fuisse.' Imo ipse Eusebius, qui in Nicæno consessu primum locum post imperatorem tenuisse videtur (vid. not. Vales. ad Euseb., lib. iii. de vita Const., cap. 11.) (scriptor integerrimus, et temperati ingenii, neque Arianis partibus iniquus,) expresse refert, fidei in eo concilio conscriptæ episcopos omnes οὐκ ἀνεξετάστως, non temere et inconsulto, sed post accuratum, deliberatum et diligens singularum sententiarum

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVII.

diligent examination of all the several sentiments made in the presence of the emperor: and particularly to the very clause itself of the consubstantiality, or the ὁμοούσιος, with their unanimous consent. See the epistle of Eusebius to those of his diocese extant in the first book of the Ecclesiastical History of Socrates, chap. viii. At the beginning indeed of the council, there were some no small strivings among certain of the bishops; but which were soon pacified and laid to sleep by means of the emperor's most pious and obliging speech; as the same Eusebius doth also witness."

I have transcribed this passage in answer to that of Episcopius, because he hath cited it after another such of Le Clerc's, p. 199[1], and because it confirms what I have said before from ecclesiastical history, in answer to these slanderous citations out of these and other such writers, who will ever have an ill-will against the Nicene fathers, and all that adhere to their exposition of the Christian faith. But though this learned bishop hath been the champion of that council and its confession against all the Arian, Popish[m], or Protestant, or Socinian writers of this age, to the time of writing his books, for which he received the thanks of the assembly of the clergy of the Gallican Church[n]; yet our author hath reckoned him among those of whom he saith, "as[o] often as I consider this, I cannot, without indignation and horror, reflect upon their stupendous ignorance, or rather madness, who have made no difficulty to misrepresent the Nicene fathers as malicious or ignorant depravers of the Catholic doctrine concerning Jesus Christ, which was delivered by the Apostles, and obtruders of a new faith upon the Christian

(ac nominatim clausulæ de τῷ ὁμοουσίῳ) examen coram imperatore adhibitum, unanimi consensu subscripsisse. Vide epistolam Eusebii ad homines suæ parœciæ apud Socratem Hist. Eccles., lib. i. cap. 8. pp. 22, 23. Initio quidem concilii non leves inter episcopos quosdam concertationes fuere; sed eæ mox pia et placida imperatoris oratione facile sedatæ et consopitæ, ut idem testatur Eusebius."—Bull, ibid., pp. 7—9.]

[1] Quoted above, p. 157.

[m] As Petavius. See the Prœmium to the Bishop's Defensio, [§ 7, 8. pp. 9, sqq.]

[n] [A.D. 1694. See Nelson's Life, § lxviii. pp. 327—330.]

[o] [Hæc quoties mecum perpendo, toties fere non sine indignatione, adeoque horrore quodam, una recolo stupendam eorum inscitiam, seu potius impiam vesaniam, qui in venerandos Patres non veriti sunt palam debacchari, tanquam qui Catholicam de persona Jesu Christi doctrinam, ab Apostolis traditam, ac per tria prima secula in Ecclesia conservatam, vel malitiose, vel certe per imperitiam ac temere depravaverint, novamque fidem orbi Christiano obtruserint. — Ibid., § 3. p. 3.]

UNFAIR CITATIONS.

world." Nay, this our author hath done against his declaration of his intention in writing that noble defence; "This[p] is the scope and design of my undertaking in this work, to shew clearly that all the approved fathers and doctors of the Church, who lived from the time of the Apostles to the council of Nice, taught the very same doctrine, though sometimes in different words, and different ways of speaking, that the Nicene fathers did of the Godhead of the Son against Arius and other heretics."

This shews the genius, I should have said the evil genius of these men, who can thus abuse a living author[q], whose works have been lately reprinted[r] with as much, if not with more notoriety, than any book of the same time.

To these I might add his other fraudulent citations out of authors which have been effectually answered, without taking notice of the answers, of which, to his dishonour, I gave a remarkable instance in his quotations to blacken Archbishop Laud. So he quotes[s] a passage out of Amyntor, which Mr. Toland cited with an evil intention out of a very learned author, to discredit the authority of the Scripture canon, though there was never a better answer written, than it received in two impressions of a book entitled, The Canon of the Scripture vindicated, in answer to the objections of J[ohn] T[oland] in his Amyntor, by John Richardson [B.D.] London, 1701[t].

[p] [Scilicet hic operis et incœpti nostri scopus, hoc institutum est, ut clare ostendamus, quod de Filii divinitate contra Arium aliosque hæreticos statuerunt Patres Nicæni, idem reipsa (quanquam aliis fortasse nonnunquam verbis, alioque loquendi modo) docuisse Patres ac doctores Ecclesiæ probatos ad unum omnes qui ante tempora synodi Nicænæ ab ipsa usque Apostolorum ætate floruerunt.—Ibid., § 9. pp. 13, 14.]

[q] [Bishop Bull was living at the publication of the first edition of this work, as bishop of St. David's, to which he was elected in 1705. He died Feb. 17, 1710.—Nelson's Life, p. 404.]

[r] ["In the year 1703 Dr. Bull's Latin works were collected together into one volume in folio, by Dr. John Ernest Grabe, who adorned and perfected this new edition with his own many learned annotations, and introduced it into the world with an admirable preface, which did great justice to our excellent author as well as to his learned and judicious writing."—Ibid., p. 343.]

[s] [Rights, Preface, pp. lxxi. lxxii.]

[t] [pp. 83—105. The passage in question is a long extract from Dodwell's Dissertationes in Irenæum, Diss. I. § 38, 39. pp. 65—69. Oxon. 1689, quoted and translated by Toland, Amyntor, pp. 69, sqq.; on which Tindal's observation (Rights, Pref. lxxi.) is, "instead of shewing we have as good a proof for the Divine authority of bishops, as we have for that of Scripture, he endeavours to prove we have no better for the Scripture than for bishops."

Dodwell's "principal intention" (to quote Mr. Richardson) "was, to shew that we have as good evidence, that the practical traditions (as for instance, episcopal government) which obtained

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVII.

So[u] he hath trumped up anew the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the abbot of Hye, to whom, though but a presbyter, he saith, the Scottish bishops were subject, and cites Bede[x] in the margin for his authority; though this monkish dream of an ancient Church government in Scotland by presbyters, and the whole story of the Culdees, had been twenty years before most clearly and learnedly confuted by Dr. William Lloyd, then bishop of St. Asaph, in his book entitled, "An Historical Account of Church government, as it was in Great Britain and Ireland when they first received the Christian religion[y]." With like impudence to destroy the distinction betwixt the laity and clergy, and to prove that laymen might exercise the priestly office, he cites[z] that famous passage out of Tertullian *de Castitate*[a], though the argument taken from that passage for the priesthood of the laity, and the administration of the Sacraments by laymen, had been fully and irrefragably answered many years before

in the time of Irenæus, and were delivered as such, were really apostolical institutions, as there is for the canon of the New Testament; because the books we now receive for canonical, or our rule of faith, were not so fixed and determined, till the beginning of the second century, as to be appealed to by the Christian Church under that notion. And they were then settled upon the testimony of the same persons (and sent abroad into all places in the year 107, see his Addenda to p. 73, and his Chronology), who conveyed these traditions, and who, having been conversant with and instructed by the Apostles, were without doubt sufficiently qualified to give in evidence concerning their writings, and to distinguish them from all others, which might go abroad falsely under their names."—The Canon, &c., considered, pp. 84, 85.]

[u] Rights, p. 339.

[x] [Bede, Eccl. Hist., lib. iii. c. 4. The passage is as follows; speaking of the monasteries founded by St. Columbanus, "in quibus omnibus idem monasterium insulanum (Hy, or Iona), in quo ipse requiescit corpore, principatum tenet. Habere autem solet ipsa insula rectorem semper abbatem presbyterum, cujus juri et omnis provincia, et ipsi etiam Episcopi ordine inusitato debeant esse subjecti, juxta exemplum primi doctoris illius (S. Columbani) qui non episcopus sed presbyter extitit et monachus."]

[y] [The passage from Bede is translated and discussed, chap. vii. § 10, sqq. p. 165. in the edition of Bishop Lloyd's work appended to the 2nd vol. of Stillingfleet's Origines Britannicæ. Oxford, 1842.]

[z] Rights, pp. 168, 169.

[a] [The passage is this, "Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit Ecclesiæ auctoritas, et honor per ordinis consessum sanctificatus; adeo ubi Ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offers et tinguis et sacerdos es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, Ecclesia est, licet laici." To which Tindal unfairly adds a clause which occurs some lines after, "omnes nos Deus ita vult dispositos esse, ut ubique sacramentis ejus obeundis apti simus."—Tert. De Exhortatione Castitatis, c. 7. Op., p. 522, A. Of this work the Bened. Editors say (Vita Tertull. A.D. 213), "Librum .. de Exhort. Cast. Nicephorus, (lib. iv. cap. 54,) inter eos recenset, qui contra Ecclesiam Catholicam conscripti sunt, et in quo eo dementiæ videtur venisse ut apud tres etiam laicos, utpote Montanum et insanas ejus Prophetidas Priscam et Maximillam, esse Ecclesiam existimet." They place the statement among the heretical paradoxes of Tertullian, No. 17.]

UNFAIR CITATIONS.

by Mr. H. Dodwell, in his book entitled, *De jure Laicorum Sacerdotali ex Sententia Tertulliani* [*aliorumque veterum*] *Dissertatio* [*adversus anonymum*[b] *Dissertatorem "de Cœnæ Administratione, ubi Pastores non sunt."*] Londini, 1685.

So hath he very frequently cited Bishop Stillingfleet's Irenicum, though he is forced to confess that the "Appendix to the second edition runs counter to it[c]," he means his "Discourse concerning the Power of Excommunication," of which he saith, "the whole design of it is to maintain that doctrine of two independent powers, which he had so much exploded in his book." To what purpose then did he cite the Irenicum, not only in this place of his preface referred to in the margin, but so often after in his book, against the Church, if, as he is forced to confess, the author hath since told us, "that he knows no incongruity in admitting an *imperium in*

[b] [The anonymous writer was Grotius; his work was republished at the beginning of Dodwell's reply: it is contained also in his Opera Theologica, London, 1679, tom. iv. p. 505: a translation of it was sent out by Tindal, appended to his Second Defence of the Rights, p. 179. Dodwell argues (cap. ii. pp. 46—164.) that Tertullian does not assert as a fact, that the Church of his time held this view, but on the contrary implies (what he shews to be the case) that it did not. He then considers the value of Tertullian's individual opinion and arguments, and particularly (§ 23—25) considers the words here referred to, 'ubi tres sunt, ibi ecclesia,' which, the presence of clergy being implied, was a received maxim, 'licet laici' Tertullian's own addition.]

[c] [Stillingfleet, in 1659, at the age of four and twenty, published the work entitled "Irenicum; a weapon salve for the Church's wounds: or the Divine right of particular forms of Church government discussed and examined according to the principles of the law of nature, the positive laws of God, the practice of the Apostles and the primitive Church, and the judgment of reformed divines. Wherein a foundation is laid for the Churches peace and the accommodation of our present differences."—Works, vol. ii. p. 147. The object of this treatise was to maintain the negative of the question, "Whether any one individual form of Church government be founded so upon Divine right, that all ages and Churches are bound unalterably to observe it."—Preface to the Reader, ibid., p. 153. The sentiments contained in it are highly approved by Tindal. He gives (Pref. p. liv.) the substance of what Stillingfleet affirmed, (book i. chap. ii. pp. 45—48, Works, vol. ii. pp. 182—184,) in these words, "That the clergy have no legislative power, and that there is no law of God which lodges a power in the officers of the Church to bind men's consciences to their determination. And if the magistrate has not the sole power to oblige, we must inevitably run into these absurdities; first, that there are two supreme powers in a nation at the same time: secondly, that a man may lie under two different obligations as to the same thing." In 1662 however he published a second edition, "with an appendix concerning the power of excommunication in a Christian Church."—Works, vol. ii. p. 419, of which Tindal speaks in the passage quoted by Hickes. It is headed "A Discourse concerning Excommunication," &c., and its object is to make good the principle, "That the power of inflicting censure upon offenders in a Christian Church, is a fundamental right, resulting from the constitution of the Church, as a society, by Jesus Christ; and that the seat of this power is in those officers of the Church, who have derived their power originally from the Founder of this society, and act by virtue of the laws of it."—Works, vol. ii. p. 420. Discourse, &c. § 3. p. 416.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVII.

imperio," and that "the magistrate's power is cumulative not privative[d]?" I can scarce forbear to cite the whole passages, which he hath curtailed, because they run as counter to the Rights as he saith they do to the Irenicum; and let him write never so often, and never so much, that Discourse of Excommunication, wherein the Church is proved to be a society of a quite different original from the commonwealth, and distinct from it, will be a confutation of what he writes. But besides his Discourse of Excommunication, that great man afterwards published several pieces as counter to his Irenicum as that of Excommunication, viz., The Unreasonableness of Separation, &c. at London, 1681[e]. The Charge[f] to the Clergy of his Diocese at his Primary Visitation [in 1690]. His Sermon preached at a Public Ordination, March 5, 1684-5[g], out of which I will present him this passage: "For the Church is a society in its nature, design, duties, offices, censures, really distinct from any [mere] human institution. And no Christian who believes that the kingdom of the Messias was to be an external, visible kingdom, can be of another opinion. And although Christ be the King of kings, and Lord of lords, and therefore, as kings, they are subject to Him; yet that authority which Christian kings do exercise over their subjects, doth not overthrow the rules and orders which Himself hath established in His Church; for no power derived from Him can void or destroy His own laws and institutions. Since then the Church doth subsist by virtue of Christ's own appointment, and that Church is to have peculiar officers to instruct and govern it, it must follow that even in a Christian kingdom the Church is a society distinct from the commonwealth[h]." This is as counter to his Irenicum as any thing in his Discourse of Excommunication, in which he hath proved[i], "first, that the Church is a peculiar society, in its own nature distinct from the commonwealth[k]. Secondly, that its power over its members doth not arise

[d] [Rights, Preface, p. lv. Stillingfleet's Discourse, at the end. Works, vol. ii. p. 438.]

[e] [Stillingfleet's Works, vol. ii. p. 439.]

[f] In his Ecclesiastical Cases, [relating to the rights and duties of the parochial clergy,] vol. i. pp. 5—12. [1698. Works, vol. iii. p. 613.]

[g] [Works, vol. i. p. 355.]

[h] [Ibid., p. 366.]

[i] [See Discourse, § 10. (Irenicum, ed. 2. 1662.) p. 423. Works, vol. ii. p. 422.]

[k] [Ibid., § 11. Works, ibid.]

from mere confederation or consent of parties[l]. Thirdly, that this power of the Church extends to the exclusion of offenders from the privileges of it[m]. And, fourthly, that the fundamental rights of the Church do not escheat to the commonwealth upon their being united into a Christian state[n]." But to return from this digression to that excellent sermon; the author of it, whose Irenicum he hath so often cited, made an apology for his writing of it in the epistle dedicatory to the bishop of London[o]. He there pleads his younger years in which he wrote it, and the time when it was written, before the Church was re-established, the design with which he wrote it, to gain upon dissenters by overthrowing the *jus divinum* of presbytery, and shewing them that prelacy, which they detested as unlawful, was a lawful government; upon which account, he tells us, his superiors made him allowances, for the "scepticalness and injudiciousness of his youth, and prejudices of his education[p]." But if he had formally retracted it, it had been all one to a man whose hatred to the Church and ecclesiastical power makes him cite any thing from any author, though upon second thoughts, and farther reading and consideration, he afterwards refutes or retracts it, so it sounds well against the clergy and the Church. Surely our author could not be ignorant of all these pieces, in which that very famous and learned man hath, like an highflyer, written so many things contrary to the principles of his Irenicum; but if he had

UNFAIR CITATIONS.

[l] [Ibid., § 17. p. 431. Works, ibid., p. 428.]

[m] [Ibid., § 21. p. 438. Works, ibid., p. 433.]

[n] [Ibid., § ult. p. 446. Works, ibid., p. 437.]

[o] [Works, vol. i. p. 357.]

[p] [Stillingfleet was born April 17, 1659. He entered at St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1648, where he afterwards became fellow; John Smith being a member of the same College. Latitudinarian views were then prevalent in Cambridge, (see note m, p. 55.) Stillingfleet imbibed them and was considered to belong to that school. See Burnet, Own Times, vol. i. p. 189. He received holy orders from Ralph Brownrigg, the ejected bishop of Exeter, and had the living of Sutton, in Bedfordshire, when he published the Irenicum, as has been said, at the age of four-and-twenty. Besides the Epistle Dedicatory quoted by Hickes, he speaks more freely of this work in "Several Conferences between a popish priest, a fanatic chaplain," &c., published in 1679, where he says, p. 148, in the person of P. D. "I believe there are many things in it which, if Dr. Stillingfleet were to write now he would not have said: for there are some which shew his youth and want of due consideration; others which he yielded too far, in hopes of gaining the dissenting parties to the Church of England, but upon the whole matter I am fully satisfied the work was written with a design to serve the Church of England."]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVII.

read but one of them, in which so much is written for High Church, he cannot be excused from *fourberie*, for so often citing the book of his younger age, after the publishing of which, when he had better considered the constitution of the Church in his riper years, he wrote to prove her to be a distinct society of Christ's foundation, and to vindicate her power as such. So false is also what our author also saith[q], that "there is no way to evade" his arguments taken from the laws, to prove that the "power and jurisdiction of our bishops is derived mediately from the parliament, and immediately from the king[r];" but "by making the Church a private society, and allowing no more power to belong to it than to other private companies and clubs; and consequently, that all the right any one hath to be an ecclesiastical officer, and the power he is entrusted with, depends on the consent of the parties concerned, and is no greater than they can bestow."

SECT. XVIII.

The Powers of the Church not derived from the state.

To which I answer, first, that the Church is not a 'private voluntary society,' as he dreams, but, as I hope I have shewn it to be, a public society of Christ's institution for the whole world, and under officers and governors of His own appointment, of which universal society all men, to whom the gospel is revealed, are bound to become members, under pain of eternal damnation. Secondly, that those officers and governors derive their power and jurisdiction from Christ, and that in our Church they exercised it about a thousand years before the late laws, from which he takes his arguments, were made or perhaps so much as thought of by former Christian states. Thirdly, that the same officers and governors, in other countries, do now by authority derived from Christ, exercise their powers of legislation and jurisdiction; and have formerly exercised them in making canons, censuring unruly members, constituting and ordaining bishops, priests, and deacons, without such restraining laws. Fourthly, that those restraining laws do no more prove the ecclesiastical power to be derived from the civil, than, if the like laws were made to restrain the exercise of the paternal power, it would prove that fathers had not their power and authority from God. The state or commonwealth, if it pleases, may

[q] Rights, Pref., p. xxx

[r] [Ibid., p. xxix.]

declare that fathers and husbands, 'have no manner of domestic jurisdiction, but by and under the king's majesty, as the only supreme head of all families, to whom by holy Scripture power and authority is given to hear and determine all manner of domestic causes; and that all authority of paternal and conjugal jurisdiction is drawn and deducted from the king;' and if they please, they may also forbid fathers and husbands to exercise all or any part of their paternal or conjugal authority, without a licence from the king. And upon supposition of such laws, I would fain know of our author, whether in his own way of arguing it would follow, that parents had no antecedent Divine authority over their children, nor husbands any antecedent authority over their wives, nor either of them any power from God of legislation or jurisdiction in their families, prior to these laws.

POWERS OF THE CHURCH.

Upon supposition of such new laws let me farther observe, that our author might come upon all families with his formidable 'if's[s],' and say, 'if the parliament invested the king,' &c., 'if fathers and husbands have no domestic jurisdiction independent of the king,' &c., 'if after what hath been said, parents and husbands have an independent power,' &c. And yet, supposing such laws, with such preambles, and also penned with such a style, both parents and husbands would nevertheless still have their several powers from God. The parliament, when it pleases, may make penal laws to forbid fathers, not to mention other things, to read the Scriptures, or pray in their families, or catechise their children; and the clergy not to pray, or preach, or catechise, or baptize, or administer the holy Eucharist publicly, without the king's express commission under the broad seal; but would it follow from thence, that the paternal or sacerdotal power or duty, to do those things, commenced with those laws, or that they had no antecedent authority from God to do them before those penal laws were made? Those restraining laws therefore, which our author hath so pompously cited to prove[t] that 'bishops have no power of legislation or jurisdiction, but mediately from the parliament, and immediately from the king,' only prove that, under pain of such and such severe

[s] [Ibid., pp. xxvi. xxviii—xxx.]

[t] [Ibid.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVIII.

and terrible penalties, they cannot without the king's leave and licence first obtained, exercise the power and authority they have originally from God, or exert it in other manner, or upon other persons, than the laws have appointed: and the Church's obedience and submission to such laws (I do not say with my author above cited, "till some better times deliver us from them[u]") is no argument against the Divine original of her power, which she derived from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God. This shews the fallacy of one of his killing 'if's' in his preface[x], which is this; "If those bishops (saith he) who happen to be authorized by the king to consecrate any other bishops." Where authorizing hath a double entendre; for it may signify either giving the original power of consecration to those bishops, or the power to exercise that original power of consecrating, which they had from God before, and which their predecessors exercised freely from the time of the Apostles, till the times those laws were made, without such restraints. In the former sense, by which he designed to deceive his reader, his 'if' or hypothetical antecedent is false, and so then must his consequent be. For our bishops, as all other bishops who live now or formerly lived where there are no such civil laws, derive their power of consecrating from God, though in our nation they happen to be so restrained and limited in the exercise of it; and to prove this I need say no more than that if it were otherwise, as our author vainly endeavours to prove, the king might then indeed authorize any layman or civil magistrate to consecrate bishops, which is not only false, but impious for any Christian to assert. The world (praised be God) is not yet arrived to his degree of impudence and profaneness, as to believe or assert that the king by his commission may make bishops, as he[y] doth "judges or other civil officers," and I doubt not but her majesty, and all her judges both of the common and civil law, will detest this impious notion when they hear of it, and think his perverting and wresting the laws of the land to such an evil design and purpose, to be a crime of a civil nature, as well as a sin against God. He

[u] [Burnet's Reflections, &c., quoted above, p. 231.]

[x] Rights, Preface, p. xxix.

[y] Ibid.

was sensible the Scriptures were not reconcileable to his deduction of the bishop's authority and jurisdiction from the magistrate, and therefore saith[z], "nor can this be evaded by saying the Scripture requires obedience to bishops, for so it doth to judges and other civil officers; and yet none can have right to make them, except he who is a legislator himself, or acts by his authority." But the Scripture requires obedience to bishops, as to 'God's ministers' and magistrates, as to those 'who watch for our souls,' the souls of kings as well as other men, for which they must 'give an account to God;' as to the 'ministers of Christ,' and 'stewards of His house,' which is the Church, to whose spiritual authority kings and senators, when they become members of it, are to submit as well as other men. I have given him examples of many godly and great princes, who upon principle so submitted to them, as their spiritual superiors, and who were men of sound understandings[a], and as free from superstition and bigotry as from profaneness, and who had too great souls to submit to any power, but what they believed was set over them by God.

What I have here said shews the vanity of his argument[b], by which he would prove that the bishops in consecrating other bishops "act ministerially by virtue of the royal authority;" for they act as their predecessors did in all Christian countries before such laws were made, as God's ministers, who have power from Him to consecrate other bishops; which power as to circumstantials, and particularly as to persons, they exercise and bring into act as the magistrate by law appoints; but if the magistrate either refuses to have any more bishops consecrated, or will have them consecrate none but unqualified or unworthy persons, in such sad cases they owe no obedience to him, or other submission to his laws than with exemplary patience and meekness to undergo the penalties; and in such ruptures and persecutions, it is their duty to exercise that original power they derived from God prior to all human laws, and, trusting in Him, to provide as well as they can for the being and preservation of the Church. Against this original power of bishops

[z] Ibid.

[aa] [See above, p. 190, and Second Discourse, chap. ii. sect. v.]

[b] Rights, Preface, p. xxxiv.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVIII.

to make bishops he saith[c]: "but if the bishops had power from God to make bishops, nothing could be more sacrilegious than for a prince to command his ecclesiastical sovereigns, on the greatest penalty except death, in a matter on which the whole government of the Church depends." The antecedent of this argument, that bishops have such a power from God, is certainly true, and so owned to be by our laws, which confirm the form and manner of ordaining and consecrating[d], &c. But the consequent, which reflects on our princes and their restraining penal laws as sacrilegious, is his own inference, and he must look to that. For he takes the liberty in his book, to treat the magistrate in a very rude and saucy manner, telling him, that he receives his power and authority in trust from the people, and that he is their servant and minister, and accountable to them; contrary, I am sure, to the style and intendment of our laws; and I cannot guess at his meaning in it, which cannot be good, unless it be to stir up our sovereign lord the people to levy a standing army, that is, to keep themselves always ready armed to defend themselves and their natural rights against their ministers, or to provoke their ministers to keep up standing armies to restrain and overawe them. This they must do, if they permit their people to be corrupted with this rebellious doctrine, which makes them hold their crowns, and their lives too, by the basest and most precarious of tenures, the pleasure of the people. But to return to his argument, I will retort it in form upon himself, and in his own words: 'if the bishops have power from God to make bishops, nothing can be more sacrilegious and offensive to God, than to write a book, as he hath done, with the malice and calumny of a devil, against that power, and against the

[c] Rights, Preface, p. xxxiv.

[d] [13 and 14 Car. II. c. 4. s. 2. "It is enacted that all ministers in every place of public worship shall be bound to use the morning and evening prayer, administration of the Sacraments, and all other the public and common prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the book annexed to this present act, and entitled, The Book, &c., and the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons."

s. 30, 31. "And all subscriptions to be made to the 39 Articles shall be construed to extend (touching the said 36th Article above recited) to the book containing the forms and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons in this act mentioned, as the same did heretofore extend to the book set forth in the time of King Edward VI."]

bishops, as if they had assumed it to themselves.' Either all the bishops since the time of the Apostles have been guilty of sacrilege, or this impeacher of them and their sacred power is highly guilty of it; and let God and men judge, which of the two it is.

After writing against the clergy and their spiritual independent power, with all the contempt and malice that man could write; after endeavouring to prove by many sophisms that they are no better than the people's servants, whom they may dismiss at pleasure, and that the "clergy have not so much power as every petty corporation, who can make bye-laws for themselves without the consent of our kings[e];" in a word, after misrepresenting them without distinction as enslavers of mankind, and the vilest of men, he demurely wipes his foul mouth at last, and saith[f], good man, "he did all this to defend the Church of England against papists, Jacobites, and other highflyers, who caused him to engage in this controversy," and professeth that "none can have a juster esteem for all her clergy, who according to the doctrine of the best constituted Church, disown all independency;" by which, according to the principles of his book, he must mean disowning all independency upon the people, as well as the prince; and I am at a loss to know where the Church disowns all independency on the one or the other; I know no such declaration she hath made. And then as for those who do not disown all independency, after all his ridiculous outrageous abuses of them and their truly Christian principles, which oblige them to think the Church to be a society different from the state, and independent of it, he is all of a sudden full of kindness to them: "as for them," saith he[g], "who do not" disown all independency, "I cannot do them a greater kindness, than to shew them the pernicious consequences of their error, and how it necessarily makes all, who are governed by it, guilty of the most villainous practices." Vain man! who thinks to wheedle us after so much rudeness, and inhuman and unchristian usage; who hath charged us with an error, which with all his subtleties he cannot prove to be such, with a pretended error, which is a Christian truth,

[e] Pref., p. xii. [f] Rights, p. 303. [g] Ibid.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVIII.

and must shew itself to be such in all times of violent persecution, and which he not only precariously, but falsely and impudently saith, "makes all those who believe it guilty of most villainous practices;" he means, as it appears by his absurd[h] and impertinent citations, against the civil power. The first of them is taken out of my Lord Chancellor Clarendon's Animadversions on Cressy's Fanaticism[i], in defence of Dr. Stillingfleet; and it is not against the spiritual power of the Church, as a society distinct from the state, but against the unreasonable and mischievous abuse of it in the Church of Rome, which "exempts the things and persons" of clergymen "from the civil justice" of the kingdom, and the cognizance of the civil tribunals; even, as he observes, in cases of treason, "setting up another sovereign power," "another tribunal and jurisdiction," to which criminal clergymen may appeal from the civil power and tribunals; a doctrine not practised or thought of among the Christians of the pure ancient Churches, who yet believed the Church to be a society of Christ's erection, distinct from the empire and independent of it; and which the Church of England expressly disowns, and her clergy ever since the Reformation have strenuously impugned in their writings, nay, which

[h] Rights, pp. 304—308.

[i] [The full title is, "Fanaticism fanatically imputed to the Catholic Church."

Hugh Cressy was a fellow of Merton College, elected in 1627; in 1642 he was appointed canon of Windsor and dean of Leighlin, but never received any profit from either of them. In 1644 he went abroad with a pupil, and in 1646 made a public recantation of the reformed religion at Rome. He entered the Benedictine order at Douay, and afterwards became chaplain to the Queen of Charles II., and resided for the most part in Somerset House. Stillingfleet in 1672 published "A Discourse concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome, and the hazard of salvation in the communion of it, in answer to some papers of a revolted Protestant, wherein a particular account is given of the fanaticis ns and divisions of that Church." (Works, vol. v. p. 1.) In the fourth chapter, "Of the Fanaticism of the Roman Church," he reflected on Cressy's "Sancta Sophia, or directions for the prayer of contemplation, 2 vols. 8vo. Douay, 1657," and other works. Cressy replied in a work entitled, "Fanaticism fanatically imputed to the Roman Catholic Church, and the imputation refuted and retorted, by S. C. 1672." To this Lord Clarendon, who was then in exile, published a reply entitled, "Animadversions on Fanaticism, &c., by a person of honour, London, 1673," with a letter to Stillingfleet prefixed. (Imprimatur Nov. 29, 1673.) On this Cressy wrote "An Epistle Apologetical to a person of honour, 1674," and Stillingfleet replied in "An Answer to an Epistle, &c., 1675."

The passage quoted by Tindal, (Rights, pp. 304, 305,) is pp. 130—132 of Clarendon's work; it speaks of "that unreasonable, inconvenient, and mischievous distinction of ecclesiastical and temporal, as it exempts things and persons from the civil justice and the sovereign authority, and as it erects another tribunal, and sets up another distinct sovereign jurisdiction superior and independent on the other," &c.]

POWERS OF THE CHURCH.

many divines of the Church of Rome itself have written against, in defence of the civil power. The next long transcript out of Dr. Barrow, Of the Pope's Supremacy[k], is entirely against the pope's supremacy and immense power, who, as the Doctor observes, "allows men to tell him to his face, that all power in heaven and earth is given unto him[l]." Such a power it is against which he writes, as the popes usurp over the Church as well as the state, a boundless and truly tyrannical power, which cannot but "interfere" and "clash" with the peace of the one as well as the other, and is equally destructive to the rights of both. An uncontrollable power, as Christ's pretended only vicar, which would bring all Churches and their bishops, as well as all kingdoms and their kings, under one head. A monstrous power, under which Churches as well as kingdoms groan, which swallows and devours the spiritual, as well as the temporal power, "exempting great numbers of persons from subjection" to both, and "withdrawing causes" from both jurisdictions. It is against this power equally destructive to both, that the Doctor wrote; a power, as he also observes, that "exempts subjects from the authority and jurisdiction of their kings," and makes kings the pope's "lieutenants, vassals, and feudatories[m]," and also utterly destroys the ancient aristocratical and collegiate government of the Catholic Church. But though there is so vast a difference between the true independent power of the Church, and the false independent power of the pope; yet to deceive unwary, and gratify willing readers, the Doctor, who wrote against the pope's supremacy, must be knavishly cited by him for the sake of independent power. But he knows very well the different sense of "independent," with respect to these two powers. For when we speak of the independent power of the Church, we only mean that it hath a power and policy of its own, different from that of the empire, upon which it must subsist in all countries, be it united with or disunited from the commonwealth, be it in a state of peace and union, or of persecution and rupture, from the civil

[k] [Rights, pp. 305—308. The passage is in vol. vii. of Barrow's collected Works, pp. 301—308. Oxford, 1830. It is a statement of the evils resulting from "two powers (spiritual and temporal) co-ordinate and independent of each other."]

[l] [Barrow, ibid., p. 290.]

[m] [Ibid., pp. 308—312.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVIII.

government; and that this independent power of the Church is not a co-ordinate power, and repugnant to the empire, but subordinate to it, the Church being a society which gives to Cæsar all the things that are Cæsar's, which subjects her people and priests to his authority, be he believer or unbeliever, friend or foe, protector or persecutor; and which exempts none of her society from his obedience or tribunals, or pretends to depose him, or dispose of his dominions, though he turn apostate, heretic, or tyrant; or to lift up any hand against him, except in prayer to heaven; but on the contrary she teaches her people to suffer evil from him patiently; and let me tell him, that this pure[n], holy, and peaceable doctrine of not resisting the magistrate, is that which keeps the Church from thwarting the state, or clashing with it, even when it clashes with the Church, much more from putting it into that condition of distraction and confusion, as Dr. Barrow shews from history, as well as reason, the papal power doth[o].

To as little purpose he cites Gualterus and Gomarus about the papal supremacy[p], and Dr. Scott[q] for saying, "that before the coming of Christ, the authority of princes was bounded by no law but that of nature, and that the Christian religion is so far from retrenching their power, that it abundantly ratifies and confirms it." Whereas the Doctor speaks of the

[n] See Dr. Parker's excellent book of Religion and Loyalty, part i. § 5. [Religion and Loyalty, or a demonstration of the power of the Christian Church within itself. 8vo. London, 1684. part ii. 1685. The author was Dr. Samuel Parker, afterwards bishop of Oxford. See note a, p. 67.]

[o] [Barrow, ibid., pp. 309, 310.]

[p] ["Foreign divines have not scrupled to own that this doctrine of two independent powers is antichristian and the spawn of popery; the judicious Gomarus for instance saith, (In Commonit., p. 16,) 'That the papists acknowledge two supreme powers, one not subject to the other; but the true preachers of the Divine word account it as a mark of antichrist, who exalts himself above all that is called God.' And the famous Gualterus (Hom. 24. in 1 Cor. v.) makes the asserting two such powers to flow from popery."—Rights, pp. 308, 309.]

Francis Gomar was professor of divinity at Leyden in 1603, together with Arminius, and one of his earliest and chief opponents; so that from him the Calvinists were called Gomarists. He was afterwards professor in several other universities, and died in 1641. His collected works were published in folio at Amsterdam in 1644. Rodolph Gualter was one of the early Swiss Reformers, and succeeded Bullinger as chief pastor at Zurich. He was a correspondent of our divines, and dedicated to Archbishop Grindal and other English bishops the work to which Tindal refers. He died in 1586. See the Zurich Letters, Cambridge, 1845.]

[q] [Rights, p. 309, quoting "The Christian Life, by John Scott, D.D.," part ii. chap. vii. sect. x. "Concerning the ministers of the kingdom of Christ," (in substance,) vol. iii. pp. 48—50, of Scott's collected Works. Oxford, 1826.]

authority of princes only as to civil matters[r], in which princes exercise their authority, and in which religion doth not retrench, but ratifies and confirms their power in such a manner as is inconsistent with this writer's ridiculous origin of civil government, and his whole scheme erected thereupon.

From hence it is evident how knavish, as well as impertinent and malicious, our author is in joining "papists" with "Jacobites and other high-flyers," as he calls all true Churchmen, whose principles he knows are as contrary to popery and the papal power, as good is to evil, or light to darkness. Thus a sly veteran atheist or theist, when he hath written against Christianity and Christians, with all the art and spite he can, may after all the harm and dishonour he hath done religion, ridiculously pretend, that he "engaged in the controversy only to defend it against" fanatics, enthusiasts, bigots, and other superstitious high-flyers[s]; but that "none can have a juster esteem" for all professors of Christianity, who disown enthusiasm, bigotry, and superstition, and are not of that strait-laced, narrow sort, who confine the Church to their own pale and party; and as for them, who are not such, "he cannot do them a greater kindness, than to shew them the consequences of the others' error[t];" and then pick passages out of any author who hath written against enthusiasm, bigotry, and superstition, and shewed the evil practices of those who are guilty of them, as if they were the consequences of true, pure, and primitive Christianity; and that all Christians who were not Latitudinarians, i. e. all true and strict Christians, who defend the ancient faith, rights,

[r] [The words given by Hickes are Tindal's abridgment of Dr. Scott's words. Hickes appears not to have consulted the original; the passage is this; that (with the single exception of cases where "man's command and God's do apparently clash and interfere with each other,") "in all cases whatsoever, whether temporal or spiritual, civil or ecclesiastical, sovereign powers have an unalienable right to be obeyed." And "since before their subjection to Christ God had bounded their authority by no other law but that of nature, it must either be made appear that the law of nature did then limit their authority only to civil causes, (which I am sure is impossible,) or it will necessarily follow that it extended also to spiritual and ecclesiastical; and if it did so then it must do so still, unless it be made appear that Christianity has retrenched and lessened it." And he proceeds to argue against the possibility of two independent powers, and for the absolute subordination of the Church to the civil power.—Scott's Works, ibid., pp. 50, sqq.]

[s] [Rights, p. 303.]

[t] [See Rights, pp. 303, 304.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVIII.

and polity of the Church against all innovations, were by their principles in danger to be such.

So he may write another book with like artifice and malice against the honourable and most useful profession of the law, and without distinction represent lawyers as he hath done the clergy, as the vilest of men, and then think to come off with saying he wrote only against Chicane and Chicaneurs. Or he might, if he would, write in the same manner against government, particularly against monarchy, which he doth not love, and without distinction represent all monarchs in common as tyrants, pests, and grievances of mankind, and then demurely pretend that he only wrote against such high-flying monarchs, or other pretended supreme governors, who say they are the ministers of God, and not of the people, "to shew them the pernicious consequences of their error;" but as for those who disown that principle, and, according to the doctrine of his book, own themselves to be the ministers, servants, and trustees of the people, to whom they are accountable, that "none can have a juster esteem for them than he."

But though in his book he hath made kings no better than the servants of the people, yet inconsistently with himself and his noble scheme of government, he magnifies their supremacy in spirituals, and would make them civil popes to the Church, who have power to exempt her subjects from their spiritual obedience and subjection to her, to inflict all her spiritual censures, and execute all her spiritual offices, and in short, to be the reverse of the pope to the clergy, and plainly to be the hierarchs of the Church, as the pope pretends to be to them. This papal-like power to devour and swallow up the power of the Church, and destroy her jurisdiction and tribunals, he gives to our monarchs over the Church of England, especially in parliament, which he will not allow them over any other Church or religious society of his own making, in which "the peasant is equal in authority to the prince." But he is free and prodigal in giving our princes as great power, and as destructive over the national Church and her clergy, as the popes claim over them; and the true reason why he is so free to give what no human power on earth can give them, is, that when this civil Demo-

POWERS OF THE CHURCH.

gorgon, as he would make the magistrate, had devoured the Church; his Polyphemus of the people, in virtue of their natural rights, might swallow up the magistrate; and then our princes and priests would soon know by what tenure they hold their crowns and mitres, and the masters whom they had the happiness and honour to serve. But to return him the civility and kindness he professeth for the clergy; after all his barbarous usage of us, we have great reason not only to shew him, but to shew the government, the pernicious consequences of his error, in making our kings and queens, contrary to our laws, the servants and trustees of the people; an error fruitful of all mischief, and fatal to kingdoms and commonwealths, that hath made more civil wars, and shed a thousand times more blood, than all the tyrants in the records of history; an error from which the Greeks and Romans turned with detestation, as fast as they became Christians; an error contrary to the Scripture history of the original of mankind; a foolish and absurd, as well as a precarious error, founded in nothing but an imaginary state of nature, which never was, and never could be; in a word, an error which gives infinite pretence to ambitious and crafty demagogues in all countries, to lead the people at all times into rebellions, to their own destruction, and to become slaves to their pretended deliverers, whose little fingers are commonly heavier than their lawful governor's loins.

He hath not omitted one statute in his Preface, from which he could take any the least argument, to prove that the clergy derive their power of inflicting spiritual censures from the laws of the land. He goes about to prove it from the causes of wills and marriages[u]; but doth it follow, because they derive the cognizance of those civil causes from the temporal power, that therefore they derive their power of inflicting spiritual censures from it, which they had and exercised before the Church had any temporal privileges granted to it, and would retain, though they were all taken away? To as little purpose he goes about to prove it from 2 and 3 of Edw. VI. [c. 13,][v] which declares it "lawful for every judge

[u] Rights, Preface, p. xxvi. ["If in the causes of wills, marriages, and such like, the clergy judged by an authority derived from the laws of the land, must they not from the same derive their power to inflict spiritual censures in these causes?"]

[v] [Ibid.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVIII.

ecclesiastical, to excommunicate" any person that would not obey his sentence given in causes of tithes. But that is no more than to make it lawful for the ecclesiastical judge, by the temporal law, to execute the power of excommunication, which belonged to him before. He also proves it to as little purpose from 5 and 6 Edward VI. c. 4[x], which enacts, "that if any person shall by words only quarrel, chide, or brawl in any church, or church-yard; it shall be lawful for [unto] the ordinary . . ." to suspend a layman so offending *ab ingressu ecclesiæ,* and a clergyman from the ministration of his office, as long as he shall think meet. To which I answer, with submission to better judgments, that these are spiritual censures which the ordinary had a right to inflict for the same crime before this act was made. As for suspension of a clergyman from the ministration of his office, every one knows it is a spiritual and canonical censure; and as for suspension of a layman from entering into the church, it was a spiritual punishment, which St. Ambrose inflicted on Theodosius the Great and he submitted to; and this act therefore did not then first make it lawful for the ordinary to inflict these censures for that crime, but oblige him to do it, which without the law perhaps he might not have done. This law therefore doth not suppose, as he suggests, that it was not lawful for the ordinary to inflict these censures for the same crime before; but its intention was to bind him to inflict them, and to encourage and assist him in so doing.

He also proves the power of the magistrate to inflict spiritual censures, from 3 Jac. I. c. 5[y], which enacts, "that every convict popish recusant shall stand, and be reputed and disabled as a person lawfully and duly excommunicated, and as if he or she had been so denounced and excommunicated:" where it is plain the intendment of this act is only to put convict recusants in the condition of excommunicates, as to civil penalties, incapacities, and disabilities. And this he seems to grant by saying, "if this is not a full proof[z];" but though he thought it not a full, or I believe a good proof, yet he would make use of it, because it might take with undiscern-

[x] Rights, Preface, p. xxvi. [y] [Ibid.] [z] Ibid., p. xxvii.

ing readers, especially with such as are no friends to the spiritual authority of the Church.

From this he proceeds[a] to a certain proof from paragraph XI of 5 and 6 Edw. VI. c. 4. which enacts, "that if any person shall smite or lay violent hands upon any other in church or church-yard, then *ipso facto* he shall be deemed excommunicate, and be excluded from the fellowship of Christ's congregation, and that every person who maliciously strikes any person with any weapon in church or church-yard, or shall draw any weapon in church or church-yard, with an intent to strike another, shall be, and stand, *ipso facto*, excommunicated." To which, under correction of the learned in the civil and canon laws, I answer, that this act is no certain proof, or strictly speaking any proof at all, of the magistrate's power to inflict spiritual censures, because the sentence of the ecclesiastical judge is necessary before this excommunication by the law can have any spiritual effect upon the criminal, though the crime or fact, properly speaking, were notorious, or such as needed no proof. This I say in reply to our author, who affirms, that the sentence of the judge ecclesiastical is only thought necessary, "that the offender might judicially appear to have been guilty of the fact[b];" but I humbly conceive it must also be necessary to exclude the offender from the "fellowship and company of Christ's Church," which no temporal power without the spiritual can do. For if the temporal power of itself could validly, and with spiritual effect, exclude from the fellowship and communion of Christ's Church, then its excommunications would have the same effect in all other Churches, as well as in those of its own dominions, and its excommunicates would be excommunicates all the Christian world over, and so a man standing excommunicated in England merely by lay power, would have no right to communicate in any other part of the Catholic Church. But this I presume none but our author, or such as he, will be so hardy as to affirm; and therefore, till I am better informed, I will make no difficulty to say, that when the law doth annex the penalty of excommunication to a crime or fact, the sentence of the spiritual judge is necessary, not only to make the truth thereof appear (for that any

[a] Rights, Preface, p. xxvii.

[b] [Ibid.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XVIII.

temporal judge might do) but to the excommunication itself, to bring the act to its actual and last effect, or what perhaps will please our author better, to the very execution of the act: for as high-church and high-flyer as he may call me, or think me to be, I think, in such cases as this before us, where the magistrate enacts that a man guilty of a crime that deserves excommunication shall be "excluded from the fellowship of Christ's Church," that the spiritual ought to be "the executioner" of the temporal power, and to be aiding and assisting thereunto. I say, "in all such cases, where the magistrate enacts that any person guilty of a crime which deserves excommunication," because if excommunication were enacted as a punishment for smaller crimes, which in no wise deserved it, there the spiritual power is not to obey the magistrate. As for example, if an act of parliament were made to excommunicate any person who happened to fall asleep in the church, the spiritual judges ought rather to suffer any penalty, than to pronounce the sentence of excommunication for such an offence, that was no more than a common human infirmity, for which the offender could not deserve to be excluded from the communion of saints, from the fellowship of the Catholic Church. Such a solemn abuse and profanation of the power of the keys would itself deserve excommunication; and therefore the spiritual magistrate, whose duty I own it to be obedient to the temporal in all lawful things, ought rather, with Christian patience and submission, to undergo any punishment, than to do so wicked and unlawful a thing.

SECT. XIX. On the Sacerdotal Office and Ordination.

He argues against the sacerdotal office and order, as he thinks, in a very popular, I am sure in a very mobbish manner, as if it had nothing peculiar and proper to it, which is unlawful for others to do. "If the office of a clergyman," saith he[c], "was so appropriated, that it was unlawful for others to meddle with it, they ought not to visit the sick, reconcile differences, or instruct one another in those duties they owe to God and each other. . . . Every Christian is obliged to reprove, rebuke, admonish, exhort, and warn one another; . . . and that some have more convenience for doing this than others, depends upon the people's allowing them a sufficient

[c] Rights, pp. 130, 131.

maintenance wholly to attend that end." Very right, Sir; for, as it is commonly said, it is likewise very true, that 'what is every body's is no body's work;' and therefore in his scheme of a Church two things, it seems, are convenient, and fit to be done; first, that some men should be appointed on purpose wholly to attend on these holy offices; and secondly, that they should have a sufficient maintenance allowed them upon that account. Here then it is lawful for the people, though not for God, nor the prince, to annex profits, and tack revenues and preferments to the ministers or officers of holy things. But this in other places was to 'discourage impartial examination,' to 'make men hypocrites,' and 'dissemblers with God[d],' to 'give the magistrate a power over men's properties,' to 'encourage men to profess such speculative opinions as they do not believe[e],' 'and invent a thousand sophistical and knavish methods' (which none understands better than himself), 'to defend them, to the infinite prejudice of truth.' 'It is the occasion of extinguishing humanity among Christians, of dividing them into several sects[f],' and 'makes the clergy in all countries the magistrate's deputies, and generally speaking, of the religion to which they find preferments annexed[g].' These are the evil influences and effects of maintenance and revenues, to support the ministers of Christ; but contributions and salaries, though never so great, with houses never so good, would have no such effects on the ministers of the people in any church of their erection. If a congregation consisting of a thousand rich Arians, Socinians, or other Unitarians, should according to his scheme choose our author for their minister, then, good man, nothing would be too much or too great for him. Four or five hundred per annum would not 'discourage him from impartial examination;' nay were the whole nation Arians, and the people had as many ministers of their own making and choice, as the Church hath canonical ministers now, their maintenance and revenues, which generally speaking would be much better than that of the clergy, would in no degree influence their pure minds, or incline them to be of that religion, which in all its congregations

[d] Rights, p. 17.
[e] Ibid., p. 22.
[f] Ibid., p. 23.
[g] Ibid., p. 25.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XIX.

had such comfortable maintenance for its ministers of the people's choice. But to let this pass, is it necessary for the people, in his notion of Churches, to appoint some to minister in holy things; and may not God appoint an order of men for the same purpose in the Holy Catholic Church? Are there some holy things, some religious duties, as he is forced to acknowledge[h], that "cannot conveniently be left in common, but for order sake" must be committed to the care of some particular persons, who are wholly to attend them; and may not God set apart a perpetual order and succession of public officers and ministers in His Church, for ever to attend those things; with peculiar power and authority under Christ to teach them, as doctors or preachers; to govern them as rulers; and to bless them as priests? Whether He hath done so or no, is, as I must still observe, a *question of fact*, which must be determined by the practice of the Apostles, and the universal practice of the Church in all places since the time of the Apostles, which is the best commentary upon their practice; and I will yet presume, that the ancient histories of the Church and writings of the eldest fathers, many of which I have produced in the following letters, as evidence for the Divine institution of the Christian priesthood, are much better testimonies for it, than all that our author hath said, or by the help of all the deistical or atheistical clubs in the town can say against it. Well, but "every man can do what a clergyman doth;" but can he do it with sacerdotal authority? Can he do it as a liturg, as a public officer and minister of Jesus Christ? And "it is every man's duty to do what he can to save another's soul[i];" but can he do it in a sacerdotal ministerial manner, as an officer to whom God hath committed the charge of souls, as a shepherd of the flock over which Christ hath made him an overseer, as a watchman for souls, as a minister of the New Testament, and as an ambassador from God to men? So he saith, "It is every Christian man's duty to reprove, rebuke, admonish, exhort[k]:" but how? to rebuke sharply with all authority, to reprove and rebuke as a superior, to admonish as one that hath the rule over others in the Lord, and after due admo-

[h] Rights, p. 131. [i] [Ibid.] [k] [Ibid.]

nition to censure; to give things in charge, as a governor; to receive accusations before witnesses, as one who was to be answerable to Him 'in the midst of the golden candlesticks,' who hath 'the sharp sword with two edges,' for mal-administration; as 'an angel of a Church,' as his servant and trustee, for 'suffering the woman Jezebel,' and 'tolerating the doctrines of Balaam and the Nicolaitans,' and not turning the teachers of them out of the Church. But still "every man can do what a clergyman doth, and it is every man's duty to do what he can to save another's soul;" and may not every woman do what a clergyman doth? And do not the texts he cites[1] to no purpose against the sacerdotal orders, relate to women as well as to men, to the sisters as well as the brethren of the Church. This he cannot but acknowledge, unless he will contradict his Ulpian, upon whose authority the civil law saith, *verbum hoc 'siquis' tam masculos quam fœminas complectitur*[m]. I would also fain know of our author what things a Jewish priest was to do, which every man or woman could not do as well as he? and if it was not every Jew's duty, man or woman, to save another Jew's soul? And I pray my reader to consider, if this way of arguing against the clergy is not the very same, or very like to that of Corah and Dathan[n] against Moses and Aaron, to whom they said, "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy every one of them, and the Lord is among them; wherefore then lift you up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord?" 'You lift up yourselves,' said they, 'above the people of the Lord,' and so saith our author of the clergy, that 'they assume to themselves a power, an arbitrary power over the people,' and 'put themselves in God's place;' just indeed as Moses and Aaron did, who did not put themselves in God's place, because God put

[Rev. ch. 2, and 3.]

[Numb. 16. 3.]

[1] Ibid., pp. 132, 133. [The texts cited are, Heb. x. 24, 25; iii. 13; Col. iii. 16; 1 Thess. v. 11; 1 Cor. xiv.; Acts viii. 4.]

[m] [Digest., lib. i. tit. 16. de verborum significatione, sect. i. referring to Ulpian, lib. i. ad edictum.]

[n] See Dr. Featly's "Dippers Dipt, [or the Anabaptists ducked and plunged over head and ears, at a disputation in Southwark," by Daniel Featly, D.D.] ed. 5. 1651, Article iv. ["Concerning the calling of pastors. Anabaptist. That there ought to be no distinction by the word of God between the clergy and the laity; but that all who are gifted may preach the word, and administer the Sacraments;" which Featly proceeds to refute. Argument ii. is that God inflicted most severe punishments upon Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, &c.]

them in His. Indeed this anabaptistical and quaker-way of arguing is of as much force against Moses as against Aaron, against all orders of men in the state as well as in the Church, that is, it is of no force at all. For what cannot other men do as well as the king, or his judges, or justices of peace? But can they do it legally, can they do it validly, or *cum juris effectu,* with effect in law? What cannot other citizens do, as well as my lord mayor? But can they do it with the same authority? And is it not every man and woman's duty to keep the peace of the kingdom, and of the city where he dwells? But is it their duty to keep it as public officers and legal guardians of the peace? Thus men of our author's implacable hatred to priesthood matter not how they argue, or what they say, so it be against the order, or succession, or revenues of the clergy, or what confusion they bring upon the world, if they can but confound priests.

The doctrine of the Church being a society of God's institution, or the external visible kingdom of Christ upon earth, being, for want of due instruction, not so well understood by all Christians in these as in ancient times, gives her enemies great advantages of deceiving the people by such like false reasonings as these, which in former ages would have made no impression upon Christian people; and whether the Church is not such a society, which hath its public officers and ministers appropriated to teach and govern their flocks, and who have power from God to censure and turn out, is, as I have had occasion to say often, *a question of fact,* of which I hope I have given sufficient evidence in the following books. But before I finish my answer to this argument, I cannot but observe, that in one place he limits his general expressions, saying[o], that "most things which the clergy are obliged to perform are every man's duty." If every man, therefore, can do but most things the clergy can do, then there are some things so appropriated to their office that other men may not do; and I would fain know of him what they are; for in other places he excepts none, no not administering the holy Eucharist, as in p. 104 and 108, where, without any reverence for God or the practice of the Church, he calls the consecration of the elements "conjuration,"

[o] Rights, p. 131.

which is a derogation and depraving of the holy office in the most profane manner, and in the highest degree. But bold and blasphemous speeches of this nature are very common with him; they are the ornaments, as well as the arguments of his book.

As for the consecration of bishops and ordination of priests, for want of arguments he ridicules and blasphemes them with all his might[p]. "I would fain [gladly] know of these gentlemen," saith he, "what they mean by giving the Holy Ghost; His person, I presume, they will not pretend to dispose of." This is a lewd sarcasm, and a most profane and insolent mocking of the bishops and their holy order, and needs no other observation. "And then," saith he, "they can only mean His gifts." Most certainly the gifts; which by a metonymy in Scripture are often called the Spirit, and which in consecration and ordination they give to the persons consecrated and ordained. But how? not in their own name, but as Peter gave soundness to the lame man, when he said, "Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have [Acts 3. 6.] give I thee; in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk." They give them by solemn prayer and imposition of hands, in His name, as the Apostles did, particularly St. Paul to Timothy, to whom he said, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery;" and "I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." This ceremony of laying hands upon persons, to confer power upon them as successors or assistants, was continued from the literal to the mystical Judaism, which is the universal Church of God. There are many instances of it joined with solemn prayer, in the texts cited in the margin; and as then in baptism, God, together with the ordinary, gave very often the extraordinary and miraculous gifts of the Spirit, but, after miracles ceased, only the ordinary gifts; so in the ordination of persons unto ecclesiastical offices, He commonly gave them both gifts, while He continued miracles in the Church; but afterwards only the ordinary gifts, particularly those which were requisite for their order, with sanctity of life and gravity of conversation,

Acts 6. 6; 8. 15, 17; 13. 2, 3; 1 Tim. 5. 22. 1 Tim. 4. 14.

2 Tim. 1. 6.

[p] Rights, pp. 74—77.

according to the prayers of the congregation; and if at any time the person consecrated or ordained received not those gifts, or after he received them lost them, it was, as in baptism, through some hinderance or default in himself, which "quenched the Spirit;" and therefore it was a trifling argument against conferring the gifts of the Holy Spirit to say[q], "If the bishops can bestow the ordinary gifts, as meekness, patience, &c., no clergyman could be without them." This way of arguing makes baptism a solemn mockery, as he saith ordination is; destroys all baptismal grace and gifts, as well as those of ordination, and utterly evacuates all the promises of Divine grace, and assistances of the Divine Spirit; and putting baptism instead of ordination, I desire any sober reader to tell me if the following passage[r], of the same tenor with the precedent, is not a profanation of the one as well as the other; "What share soever the clergy might have of the Holy Spirit before ordination, they then are possessed of no other spirit than that of pride, ambition, covetousness, uncharitableness, imposition, malice, revenge, persecution," &c. Indeed he here names the popish clergy; but any man may see he means the clergy in general, and particularly those of the Church of England, of whom he spake in the former passage, and whom in another place[s] he accuses, without distinction, of "pride and haughtiness;" and now might not a Jew say after his example, 'what share soever the Christians have of the Holy Spirit before baptism, they then are possessed of no other spirit than that of pride,' &c.; and would it be any excuse for his malice to say 'popish Christians,' to wound all Christians through the popish Christian's sides. It is also plain he means all ordainers and ordained in the following words[t]: "This is no wonder, when in so serious a concern as making of bishops and priests, both the ordained and ordainers in that Church act with a solemn mockery, one in pretending a call from, and the other in giving the Holy Ghost." But why in "that Church?" Are not the ordained and ordainers guilty of the same solemn mockery in the Church of England, as her ordinals shew[u], and he knew very

[q] Rights, p. 74.
[r] Ibid., p. 77.
[s] Ibid., p. 131.
[t] [Ibid., p. 77.]
[u] "Do you think in your heart you be truly called, [according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c., to the order and ministry of priesthood?" "I think

well? Nevertheless he hath confidence to add, he thinks with great art, this irony: "As this by no means ought to be objected to the clergy of the Church of England." But then nature overcomes art in the next words: "So here that which some of them act at the election of a bishop, is no manner of kin to this holy farce of the papists, in imploring the direction of the Holy Ghost to choose a fit person, though they are resolved beforehand to proceed according to the direction of the *congè d'élire* (he means the letter monitory[x]) and name only him whom they are bound to take by that writ." I know not whom this can concern but deans and chapters, to whom the *congè d'élire* with the letter monitory is directed; but I never heard that before or at the election they meet together to implore the direction of the Holy Ghost to choose a fit person[y]. I never heard of any such office in the Church of England for the election of bishops: but, however, many of his readers will believe it, and that is as much for his purpose as if it were true. He hath other spiteful oblique reflections on the clergy in general, couched under the phrase of popish clergy, as where he saith[z], "I cannot but observe, that the popish clergy make very bold with the three Persons of the Holy Trinity. The First they employ as their executioner, to put their judicial sentences in force." I have already made some observations on this malicious and sophistical turn of speech upon the clergy, which reflects on the Apostles, and all their successors to this day, as well as on the popish clergy, who, as in many

it."—The Form and Manner of Ordering of Priests.] "And are you persuaded that you be truly called to this ministration, [according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this realm?" "I am so persuaded."—The Form of Ordaining or Consecrating of an Archbishop or Bishop.]

[x] [Two documents are sent; the congè d'élire or licence to elect, and the letter missive with the name of the person recommended: the latter Hickes calls the letter monitory. 25 Hen. VIII. c. 20. "At every avoidance of an archbishopric or bishopric, the king may grant to the dean and chapter a licence under the great seal, as of old time hath been accustomed, to proceed to election of an archbishop or bishop," (which licence is called congè d'élire,) "and with the licence a letter missive, containing the name of the person which they shall elect and choose."]

[y] [It is however the case that the elections are held after prayers. The form of recording the election runs thus, "at which day . . . immediately after morning prayers," &c.; and the address to the bishop elect; "which said day being come, and prayers to Almighty God before all things being humbly offered up, we . . . did canonically proceed to the election aforesaid."—See the usual forms printed in the British Magazine for September, 1833, vol. iv. pp. 298, 299.]

[z] Rights, p. 76.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XIX.

other instances they teach the true ancient doctrines of Christianity, so as to censures they maintain, that God is pleased to bind in heaven whom His servants, by His own authority, bind on earth; and in this ratification of the sentence of excommunication by God, according to His own ordinance, he scurrilously saith the clergy "employ Him as their executioner." Had this man lived in the days of Moses, would he not have said, that he employed God as his executioner to destroy the Egyptians and the company of Corah? [Numb. 16.] And may he not as well say, that Azariah the priest made God his executioner to smite king Uzziah with the leprosy, [2 Chron. 26. 18, 19.] for attempting to burn incense unto the Lord? Why doth he not say, that St. Peter employed God as his executioner on Ananias and Sapphira? [Acts ch. 5.] Or that St. Paul employed Satan as his executioner upon the incestuous Corinthian? [1 Cor. 5. 5.] for he is capable of saying any thing who hath the assurance to say, that "the clergy make God their executioner," that they "put themselves in His place," and "assume a Divine power to themselves." Why doth he not say in the same atheistical way of speaking, that they assume to themselves a power to punish men eternally, that they make Him their executioner of everlasting damnation, and to this end have appointed Him a day in which He must judge the world for them? and when He hath done that for them, then they will employ Him and His angels as the executioners of that everlasting punishment, which they take upon them in His name to denounce against sinners. At this profane way of talking he may tax the Christians of pride and presumption, as Cæcilius doth Minutius Felix[a], for making God the destroyer of the machine of the world, and their executioner of the last conflagration, "in which the sun and stars," saith he, "as they

[a] [Cæcilius is a heathen objector, who says of the Christians; Quid? quod toto orbi, et ipsi mundo cum sideribus suis minantur incendium, ruinam moliuntur? quasi aut naturæ divinis legibus constitutus æternus ordo turbetur, aut rupto elementorum omnium fœdere, et cœlesti compage divisa, moles ista, qua continetur et cingitur, subruatur. Nec hac furiosa opinione contenti aniles fabulas adstruunt et annectunt; renasci se ferunt post mortem et cineres et favillas; et nescio qua fiducia mendaciis suis invicem credunt: putes eos jam revixisse. Anceps malum, et gemina dementia? cœlo et astris, quæ sic relinquimus, ut invenimus, interitum denuntiare: sibi mortuis, extinctis, qui sicut nascimur, et interimus æternitatem repromittere. . . . Hoc errore decepti beatam sibi, ut bonis, et perpetem vitam mortuis pollicentur; cæteris, ut injustis, pœnam sempiternam.—M. Minucii Fel. Octavius, cap. xi. Biblioth. Patrum, tom. ii. pp. 386, C. 387, A.]

arrogantly talk, must be consumed, and yet they themselves, forsooth, must be immortal, and live in everlasting joy." Nay, in this blasphemous figure of speech, of which I now take leave, he may mock on, and say, that Christians confine God's presence to their assemblies, and immure Him up in a heathenish manner in their temples, where they tie His ears to their prayers, and command Him, by the mouths of His priests, to grant whatsoever they ask, to execute whatsoever they desire, especially if they desire it in a certain Name. It is the devil that inspires him with rhetorical figures of this sort; and I doubt not but we shall find stores of them in his second part[b], in which he will bless the world with a farther discovery of priestcraft, unless these remarks happen to make him more sparing and cautious, and then that book will want a great part of the logic as well as rhetoric that this book hath, and by consequence be more flat and dull.

From the First he goes on to the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, which without justness of speech, or justice to their most absurd doctrine, he saith the popish priests "make out of a bit of bread[c];" but that, God be praised, concerns not our priests, whom I have reason to think he hates more than those of the Roman Church[d]. Then as to the Third Person, saith he, "they freely dispose of Him, at least of His gifts, to all they lay hands on[e]," meaning in ordination. But may he not, as I have observed before, speak in the same manner of baptism, and with the same impudence lampoon this, as he has done that. But then, saith he[f], "there are some who say, that if the popish priests have any spirit bestowed upon them at their going into orders, it is that of the priest of Apollo, when full of the god he cried,

> *Jam furor humanum nostro de pectore sensum*
> *Expulit, et totum spirant præcordia Phœbum*[g]."

The 'some' he really means are such as himself and his

[b] ["Since this discourse grows too bulky for one volume, I shall finish the rest in the next; where, if the author may be allowed to be a competent judge, the reader will find a full answer to all the arguments drawn from Scripture as well as reason for the independent power of the clergy."—Rights, p. 413. This volume never appeared. See note f, p. 184.]

[c] [Rights, p. 76.]

[d] [See above, note a, p. 48.]

[e] [Rights, p. 76.]

[f] [Ibid., pp. 76, 77.]

[g] [Claudian. de Rapt. Proserp., i. 5, 6.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XIX.

club, one of whom said[h], "He would as soon send for his coachman to adminster the Sacrament to him, as an archbishop." And by popish priests I must say again, he means all Christian priests; and had he not himself been full of Apollo, or some other demon, who formerly deceived the world, he could not have uttered such things as he hath written against Christian priests. The Pythoness in the Acts treated St. Paul and Silas in another manner; for the believing and trembling spirit in her forced her to confess that they were the servants of the most high God; but the spirit of unbelief, which possesses him, makes him deny that their successors are His servants, or the ministers of Christ, but on the contrary it inspires them with boldness to say, that their ordination is 'a solemn mockery,' 'a holy farce,' in which 'they receive no other spirit but the evil spirit of pride,' &c., and that 'their pretension to priesthood is nothing but priestcraft.'

[Acts 16. 16, 17.]

I pass over many other things, as where, after Mr. Hobbes, he calls them "a set of men[i], posted so in every parish, that they can harangue the people in public twice a-week[j];" that their doctrine of an independent power (though not his) "ought to be suppressed[k];" that "the belief of it is the folly and bigotry of priest-ridden" (and perhaps in time he will say of Christ-ridden, or Apostle-ridden) men[k]. And then he doth them the honour to cite an heathen author against them, as a sort of flatterers, "who do not worship God, but the imperial purple[l];" and whoever is a Christian of that anti-christian sort, which delights in seeing Christian priests, and their power and order, thus slandered and profaned, he may in his

[h] Preface to the Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England, &c. [where the words given are, "When we hear a layman in contempt of the priesthood declare in the presence of God before a great company in words to this effect, that when he came to die, he would as soon," &c.]

[i] Rights, p. 244.

[j] Ibid., p. 247.

[k] Ibid, p. 257.

[l] ["Themistius, in his consular oration, celebrates Jovian for giving a toleration in the Christian religion, thereby defeating the flattering bishops; a sort of men, adds he, 'who do not worship God, but the imperial purple.'" —Rights, p. 260. Themistius is praising Jovian for a toleration, on the ground that religion is beyond the emperor's concern, and that the continual change of enforced religions had made, not the bishops, but the Roman people, accused of worshipping not God but the purple. *εἶτα ἐλεγχόμεθα πάνυ γελοίως, ἀλούργιδας οὐ θεὸν θεραπεύοντες, καὶ ῥᾴον Εὐρίπου μεταβαλλόμενοι τὰς ἀγιστείας· καὶ πάλαι μὲν εἷς Θηραμένης, νῦν δὲ ἅπαντες κόθορνοι.* There is no mention of "flattering bishops."—Themistii, Orat. v. Consularis ad Jovianum Imp., p. 67, D. Paris. 1684.]

Of the Divine institution of bishops.

eighth chapter[m] regale his atheist-ridden, or theist-ridden, or sceptic-ridden may I not justly say, or devil-ridden mind.

His ninth chapter is controversial upon two points, which do not directly concern the independency of the Church. The first concerns the Divine institution of bishops, and the second the uninterrupted succession[n], both which, he saith, are attended with "numerous absurdities." "It is the prevailing opinion," saith he[o], "that the bishops are by Divine appointment governors of the Christian Church, and that no one is capable of being of that number, who derives not his right by an uninterrupted succession of bishops in the Catholic Church. I will now shew some of the numerous absurdities of this hypothesis."

But that bishops are by Divine appointment, and derive their right by uninterrupted succession, is no hypothesis, as he miscals it, but matter of fact, believed and practised for fifteen hundred years in the Christian Church. For the proof of this I might send him to many learned writers[p]; but, I hope, I have said what is sufficient to prove it in the following letters, and in the beginning of this Preface[q]. But let us see the absurdities which, he saith, attend these plain practices, which are not mere hypotheses, as he would insinuate, but will appear to any man, who reads the ancients, to be positive doctrines, most evident and constant matters of fact.

Well! let us see these grand absurdities; and first of all those which, he saith, attend the government of the Church by bishops; "First," saith he, "if making of laws and exe-

[m] [The subject of the eighth chapter is, "That the clergy's pretending to an independent power hath been the occasion of infinite mischief to the Christian world, and is utterly inconsistent with the happiness of human societies."—Rights, pp. 244—311.]

[n] [Chapter ix. "That this hypothesis of none being capable of governing the Church except bishops, and that none can be bishops except those who derive their power by a continued and uninterrupted succession in the Catholic Church from the Apostles, destroys the very being of the Church."—Ibid., pp. 312—377.]

[o] Ibid., p. 313.

[p] Such as Spalatensis, [De Republica Ecclesiastica, libri x. Auctore Marco Antonio de Dominis, Archiepiscopo Spalatensi. London, 1617.] And Bishop Bilson's Perpetual Government of the Church. ["The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church, wherein are handled the fatherly superiority which God first established in the patriarchs for the guiding of His Church, and after continued in the tribe of Levi and the prophets, and lastly confirmed in the New Testament to the Apostles and their successors; by Tho. Bilson, Warden of Winchester College," published in 1593. He became bishop of Worcester in 1596, and of Winchester in 1597.]

[q] [See Third Proposition and notes above, pp. 65, 66.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XX.

cuting of them (without both which there can be no government) be in the same persons the bishops, they will lie under a temptation to make such as more regard their own separate interest than the good of the Church[r]." Is not this a doughty argument against the legislative and executive power of bishops, which militates against all power, even against the legislative and executive, where they are separate, as well as where they are united, because they may tempt those who are vested with them to abuse them, and are in fact very often abused? This is his old popular fallacy[s] in arguing against power from the abuse of it; and I will make no difficulty to say, that it is of as much force against all natural and civil, as ecclesiastical power, nay even against all the powers and faculties of body and soul, that God hath given to man. Nay, it confounds the very power which he gives to the people, among whom the major part must determine as they think fit; they must have both the making and executing of laws, and by his consequence will lie under a temptation to make such, as regard the interest of their own party; for in all democracies the greater number is but a party, a prevailing party against the less. Nay, if this reasoning of his were true, the ancient patriarchal form of government was absurd, because the legislative and executive power was in the heads of tribes. Nay, it utterly overthrows the paternal and conjugal government and mastership in families, where the same man having the legislative and executive domestic power, as father, husband, and master, not only may, but, as daily experience shews, too often doth abuse it in a most barbarous, not only unchristian, but inhuman manner. In the last place, this Herculean argument knocks down, as it were with a club, all civil governments where the legislative and executive is in one single person, or in one single aristocratical senate, which have the making and executing of their own laws; and if our author would go to Venice, and use this argument against that government, I believe he would soon have such an answer from the Council of Ten, as his tender constitution would not like.

But he goes on, "and having the executive power, they may abuse it without the least control, there being no ap-

[r] [Rights, p. 313.]

[s] [See above, pp. 146, 178.]

peal from them; nor can the people (which cannot happen in a government founded by them) have any right to redress themselves[t]." I have already considered his argument against the bishops' executive power from this inference, that they may through human frailty abuse it[u], and shewed, that it proves so much that it loses all its force against them, and plainly proves nothing at all. But in saying the people have no appeal from them, he speaks, whether knowingly or no I will not determine, very falsely against fact. For there neither is, nor ever was any civil government, which allows its people more or larger appeals than the ecclesiastical doth from the sentences and tribunals of their bishops; but suppose it did not, is the episcopal power therefore "unlawful," "absurd," "intolerable," because there lies no appeal from it? If so, then all last resorts and appeals must be so too, even that which he pretends he would have the last appeal to, the tribunal of the people, which, let them write what they will, I dare say he and his partisans, who coax the populace so much, despise and ridicule in their hearts.

INSTITUTION OF BISHOPS.

Then he proceeds; "This being a government so tyrannical in its frame and constitution, can we suppose the Divine goodness would miraculously interfere to impose it on the Church for ever[v]?" Here, first, he uses the invidious word 'impose' for what God appointed and ordained: secondly, he seems to suppose that God imposed or appointed it for some time, though he cannot imagine He would impose it for ever; and I would fain know to what period or number of years he thinks the Divine imposition of episcopal government was to last, or when it was to become indifferent, or to expire. Thirdly, he supposes the Divine goodness did not, or could not appoint a government of that frame and constitution for ever, though the Church always believed it and received it as a standing perpetual polity or constitution; and to call this Divine frame of government absurd and tyrannical, is itself most absurd, and, as I have already observed, an impeachment not only of the goodness, but wisdom of God.

The next argument he brings against this episcopal form of government hath been brought and answered many times;

[t] [Rights, p. 313.]
[u] [See above, pp. 178, 181.]
[v] [Rights, p. 313.]

it consists in nothing but spiteful and invidious clamour against the Divine right of episcopacy, for "weakening the Protestant cause," "for unchurching the reformed Churches in other countries, particularly that in Scotland." To which I answer, first, that no strict doctrines are to be rejected for the severity of their consequences upon men who will not believe them, or if they believe them will not practise them, and who perhaps, because they are contrary to their lusts, or their worldly interests and designs, are as contrary to them; and it may be hate them, and call them 'damning,' 'destroying,' and 'unnatural' doctrines; but whatever hard or ugly names our men of large souls may give strict doctrines and principles, they are nevertheless true. By such names libertines may and do call the strict Christian doctrines of sobriety, temperance, chastity, truth, probity, fidelity, patience, especially that doctrine of the cross, passive obedience; and take upon them to make as it were new gospels and allowances for themselves, which Christ never made, saying, like our author, 'can we suppose,' 'can we believe,' that the goodness of God would give us such passions, and so strictly tie us up from the gratification of them? Can we believe that infinite wisdom and infinite goodness would make us of such a frame, and damn us for doing so and so in such and such circumstances? Can we believe that God expects the same chastity from a young man as from an old? the same strictness of life from a soldier as from a divine? or that princes must live like private men? or that men and their families must be ruined, rather than break their words or oaths? 'Away! away! these hypotheses are inconsistent with the freedoms of human nature; we cannot suppose that infinite goodness would bind us, in all times, and all places, to such strict unalterable duties, as unman us in this world, or else damn us in the next.'

Our author's way of arguing against the Divine right of episcopal government is altogether such as this; and therefore in the second place, as none of those moral doctrines, or those who preach them, can be said to damn the transgressors, but the transgressors, properly speaking, damn themselves; so it is not the doctrine of the Divine right of episcopal polity and government, or those who preach it and

adhere to it, as necessary by Divine institution, that 'weakens the Protestant cause,' or as others love to speak, 'widens the distance among Protestants,' and 'unchurches the presbyterian,' and other Churches that are not so much as presbyterian; but as our author truly speaks[w], it is they themselves who "unchurch themselves," as a society, "by throwing off a government;" and let me add, by wilfully throwing off a government, which was instituted by God for the perpetual unalterable polity of the Church. They are the men who truly weaken the Protestant cause in continuing a Church polity contrary to that which Christ and the Apostles erected for the Church in all places and ages; who take upon them the priesthood by a new uncatholic mission of their own creating; and they truly and properly 'widen the distance' among Protestants who reject the ancient apostolical mission, as needless or unlawful, and perhaps besides a few compliments[x] which some of them have lately made to episcopacy, and the episcopal mission, will not move one step towards us, but expect that we should go to them and quit the ground upon which we so safely stand. I speak this with reluctance, though with freedom and plainness, I call God to witness, not to reproach the Protestants of other Churches who have abdicated episcopacy, but in great charity and pity to them; beseeching them to consider if indeed they can justify themselves to Christ, and the Christian world, for abdicating of it, and departing from the constitution and mission of the Catholic Church. They all, except in one place[y], plead necessity for departing from it, and I would to God their plea were good. But the necessities they plead are necessities of their own making and continuing; chosen and wilful necessities; and, I am forced to say, by consequence, unjustifiable necessities; necessities out of which they may, and I think therefore ought to, extricate and deliver themselves as soon as they can; in a

[w] [Rights, p. 314.]

[x] [As Osterwald, who about the year 1704, introduced a set form of prayer into the Churches of the principality of Neufchatel, in imitation of the English Liturgy; and tried all he could to bring them to a near conformity with the English Church, being convinced that it is the most conformable in all respects to the ancient primitive Church; his example was also followed by some ministers at Geneva. See No. IV. of the Appendix to Leslie's Cassandra, part ii. 1704.]

[y] [Scotland is alluded to, see below, p. 278.]

word, necessities which in my opinion would as well justify the abdication of the presbyterian government, ministry, and mission, as the episcopal; not only the mission and ministry which the ministers of some presbyterian Churches perhaps only derive from non-presbyters[z] or mere lay-men, but also that which the ministers of others of them derive from presbyters episcopally ordained. I beseech them both, for Christ Jesus' sake, the great Apostle and High-Priest of our profession, and Bishop of our souls, who established His kingdom upon earth in the episcopal government and mission, to consider what they have done in erecting up, and continuing another government, another mission, and another ministry of their own devising, against the government and ministry set up by Divine authority for the Catholic Church, and to plead a pretended necessity for so doing; a necessity which I think would as well justify the abdication of the Lord's day, or the use of the two Sacraments, and which our neighbours might as well plead, not only for the abdication of episcopacy, but of all public forms of prayer, and administration of the Sacraments, the reading of the word of God, and confession of the Christian faith, and the Lord's prayer in Divine worship. Let it no longer be said of them that, as they would not have bishops when they might, so now they will not have them when they may. Let them not any longer give the common adversary so great an advantage against the Protestant cause, by still asking them as formerly at the conferences of Poissy and Fountainbleau[a], and more lately by the bishop of Meaux[b], Where is your mission?

[z] As Calvin and Beza. [Calvin had been admitted to the tonsure and minor orders only; Beza to none at all.]

[a] [These were the first and last of the conferences between the reformed and the Catholics of France. That of Poissy was held A. D. 1561, before the king, the queen mother, Henry then king of Navarre, his queen, and an assemblage of the nobles of the kingdom. See Thuanus, Hist., lib. xxviii. § 7. sqq. tom. ii. p. 117. London, 1733. Espencæus and Sanctius pressed the question of mission on the reformed. Ibid., § 12. p. 123. Beza had been sent especially to defend that cause; his reply is quoted below, note t, p. 283. The conference of Fountainbleau was held May 4, 1600, before Henry IV. and ten assessors, between Du Plessis and Cardinal Perron; it was broken off by the illness of Du Plessis, and the Catholics claimed the victory. Thuanus, lib. cxxiii. § 13. tom. v. p. 843. Du Perron published an account of it under the title "Actes de la conference tenue entre le Sieur Evesque d'Evreux, et le Sieur Du Plessis. Evreux 1601." The subject was the doctrine of the Sacrament, and the question of mission does not appear to have arisen.]

[b] [Hickes refers to a celebrated conference between Bossuet and Claude, then pastor of the congregation at Charenton, and the leader of the re-

INSTITUTION OF BISHOPS.

Let them not longer continue to give so just an offence to those who, upon Catholic principles and practice, strictly adhere to the episcopal communion; let them not put a longer stop to the Reformation by refusing to embrace the Divine ordinance; let them not longer hinder the progress of it, or provoke God in judgment to cast it out of countries where it is, because after so long forbearance they still delay to embrace that form of government, that ministry, that mission, and that one priesthood, which He appointed for His Church. I speak this to all the Protestant Churches, concerned, as Christian societies, to hear and consider what I say; and I speak it, according as my adversary would direct me to speak, to the whole Church in every place, to the people as well as the ministers, more especially to the magistrates as the chiefs of the people; I speak it from my own conscience to theirs, and I call God again to witness that I speak it to them in the greatest charity and compassion, heartily bemoaning their condition, and as heartily wishing I had not so just occasion given me to speak it; I speak it also with zeal for their perfecting their reformations, and I hope with as true a Christian zeal as St. Ignatius[c] wrote unto the Christians of Smyrna, to whom he said, "Hearken unto the bishops, that God may hearken unto you. My soul shall be security for theirs, who are subject to the bishop with the presbyters and deacons, and may my portion be with theirs in God." With the same assurance and affection let me presume to speak to the reformed Churches abroad; 'Hearken unto episcopacy, that God, who founded it in the person and office of His Son, and appointed it for the government of His kingdom, may hearken unto you; *ἀντίψυχον ἐγώ· ἀντίψυχον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμά μου,* my soul shall answer for

formed. The conference was begun March 1, 1678. The accounts of it were first handed about in MS., but afterwards printed. Bossuet's words are, "Mais leurs pasteurs d'où sont-ils venus? Se sont-ils aussi détachés, avec cés prêtendus fidèles, du corps de l'Eglise Romaine, pour perpétuer dans l'Eglise ainsi réformée le ministére Ecclésiastique? Nullement; ce n'est pas ainsi que M. Claude l'entend.—Bossuet, Reflexions sur un ecrit de M. Claude, 1682. Œuvres completes de Bossuet, tom. xxiii. p. 409. 8vo. Versailles, 1816. For Claude's view, which was the same as Calvin's, (note d, p. 274,) see note p. 283.]

[c] S. Ignat. Epist. ad Polycarp. [§ 6. *τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε, ἵνα καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῖν· ἀντίψυχον ἐγὼ τῶν ὑποτασσομένων τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτέροις, διακόνοις· καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν μοι τὸ μέρος γένοιτο σχεῖν ἐν Θεῷ.*—Patr. Apost., tom. ii. p. 41. The words are addressed to the Christians of Smyrna, through St. Polycarp their bishop.]

yours, I will be your security to God for submitting to episcopacy; if you sin in so doing, let my soul answer to Him for it; and when you return to it, then let my soul be with yours, then let my lot and portion be together with yours in God.' I say 'when you return to it;' for your Churches, which you have happily reformed in doctrines, as all other Churches throughout the Christian world, when first planted, were founded and formed in, and with it; it was the government of them from the beginning, and great would be the joy in heaven and earth would you return to it again. Tell me, I beseech you, why should you not be perfectly reformed? why should you not reform yourselves in both points, in the primitive form of government, as a Christian society, as well as in the primitive faith, as a Christian sect? You have great and laudable zeal for all the positive doctrines of Divine revelation, and why not for the positive ordinances of Divine institution? Nay, how comes it to pass that you who retain all other things of Divine institution, as baptism, the Lord's day, the holy Eucharist, and ordination, should reject this? What hath episcopacy done to be thus cast off, and to deserve abdication? Hath it been so profaned, so abused, and so polluted in the papal Church, as Calvin[d] tragically complains; and hath not almost every thing in the Christian religion been so too? Restore it then in its ancient purity, with the Christian doctrines, to your Churches, or, as I should rather say, restore your Churches to it, that you may thereby, with the ancient apostolical faith of Divine revelation, have the ancient apostolical government and priesthood of Divine institution, and thereby of a certainty recover the mission, and become united to the body of the Holy Catholic Church. Pardon my Christian freedom, I beseech you; for I argue

[d] Epist. ad Sereniss. Regem Poloniæ. Genevæ, Nonis Dec. M D LIV. [Ac primum horribiles tenebras, quæ passim grassantur; errorum colluviem, qua obruitur totus fere mundus: abusus et corruptelas, quibus fædata est religio, non attingam . . . . Superest nunc altera quæstio: ut legitima sit successio, et a quibus ordinandi sunt pastores . . . Totum sacerdotium Papisticum non solum impia est veri ministerii profanatio, sed execrabilis in Christum contumelia: ut quisquis est sacerdos papalis, donec titulum illum abjecerit, Christi servus esse nequeat . . . Hic, fateor, optandum esset, ut valeret continua successio, ut functio ipsa quasi per manus traderetur . . . . Quia autem Papæ tyrannide abrupta fuit vera ordinationis series, novo subsidio nunc opus est ad Ecclesiæ instaurationem . . . Omnino extraordinarium fuit hoc munus quod Dominus nobis injunxit, dum opera nostra ad colligendas Ecclesias usus est.—Joannis Calvini Epistolæ et Responsa, Opera, tom. vi. par. ii. col. 187—192. Genevæ, 1617.]

with you, and urge you upon a received principle, *quod omnibus, quod ubique, quod semper*[e]; upon a principle that is attested by the same witnesses that attest the number of the books and the Divine authority of the Scriptures; and therefore a principle, which in arguing with you will admit of no flattery, nor the least degree or semblance of flattery, compliment, or complaisance. For principles, believe me, Sirs, are principles; they may easily be broken, but cannot be bent; principles, especially Christian principles, require free and plain dealing; especially among Christians, who ought neither to write or speak such things, or in such manner, when Divine doctrines or ordinances are in the case, as to please men, but to please God. I say with the Apostle, "to please God," who expects great regard from His people as well to His positive laws, which He commands us to obey, as to His positive doctrines, which He commands us to believe; to His revealed political, as well as to any other of His revealed doctrines; to the doctrines which the Church is concerned to practise, as a society, as well as to those which she is concerned to profess, as a sect. I would have addressed myself to you with more latitude and compliance, could I have done it with a good conscience. I might indeed have told you that "the succession of the ministry is of less consideration than the succession of the faith, and subordinate to it, as the means to the end[f]." But if this may serve as some plea for those who really using all endeavours, yet could not have episcopal mission and priesthood, yet it could serve them no longer than they were in that supposed state of unavoidable and insuperable necessity, which never was nor now is your case. I might also have told you, "it was reasonable to presume that God of His infinite goodness may supply the want of His own ordinance among you." But this I could not do for some reasons; first, because the cases wherein men presume, or rather hope, that God of His infinite mercy and goodness will make such supplies and allowances, are cases of invincible ignorance, or invincible necessity, not to be avoided by any pains or endeavours, neither of which, I am called to say it again, either is, or ever was your

INSTITUTION OF BISHOPS.

1 Thess. 2. 4.

[e] [Vincent. Lirin. Commonit. i. c. 2. Bibl. Patr., tom. x. p. 103, C.]

[f] [These passages appear to be quotations; but the Editor does not know from what work they are taken.]

case. Secondly, because the goodness of God, if He pleases, may in such cases supply all defects in Churches, as well as one; even the want of all ministry, as well as the want of that ministry which we think you ought to have; nay even the want of Sacraments in those religious societies which reject them: and therefore, in the third place, those extraordinary mercies, being secrets which belong to God Himself, ought to be no encouragement to us to cast off His institutions, or to continue in the want of them, when we may have them. It is not therefore reasonable, as I conceive, to presume that God, though infinitely merciful and good, will supply unto us the want of such things, which we may supply ourselves with, but will not. I had much rather therefore desire you not to trust to those extraordinary supplies, which when God grants, we cannot tell whether He grants or no. His known, ordinary, covenanted mercies are the greatest and most comfortable security for all Churches, as well as for all particular Christians; and therefore your truest security will be to reform your Churches into the first Divine government, ministry, and priesthood, in which for certain they were first formed. Nay, rather than seem to flatter you with the hopes of God's supplying the want of those things by His extraordinary mercy, I would for God's sake beseech you to consider how far the present constitution of your Churches agrees, or disagrees, with your, and our belief of the Holy Catholic Church, or the One Catholic and Apostolic Church, which is the corporation of all true Christians, and of all true Churches, founded into one communion by one priesthood, as well as upon one confession of faith; and I leave it to yourselves, after serious consideration, to determine whether your want of that ministry, in which the whole Catholic Church and all the members of it were founded, as in an unchangeable Divine institution, doth not press you with great difficulties, which relate to that new frame and constitution of a Church which you have devised for yourselves, so different from the primitive form.

All this I have said to you in answer to my adversary's objection; but why do I say my adversary? for you will find he is as much an adversary to your Churches and ministry as ours. He makes[g] this objection of "your unchurching

[g] Rights, p. 314.

yourselves by throwing off the episcopal government," with an ill design upon you, as well as upon us. He would render us odious unto you for maintaining the principle upon which we have reformed, and which I think it is not in the power of man to change. But if you will not come up to that principle and practice, we hope you will still not only bear with us, but still approve what we have done in reforming ourselves. But as strict and inviolable a principle as I take it to be, yet, I protest in the presence of God, so far am I from having any ill will to you, who I think live in the violation of it, that as the Apostle of his great affection for his brethren saith, he could wish that he were accursed for them from Christ; so my love is so passionate for you all, and my good will so great, that I could wish for your sakes it were not a principle; but what God hath made so for all times and places, cannot be unmade; what He hath so joined with His Church, no man ought to put asunder from it, nor lay other foundation for that holy building than He hath laid, who is the Founder as well as the chief corner-stone of it, and purchased it with His most precious blood. I appeal to what in great kindness and pity I formerly preached[h] and published in behalf of some of you, for the sincerity of this declaration; nor do I repent in the least of the good character I have given of them, though Monsieur Baudan's sermon[i],

INSTITUTION OF BISHOPS.

[h] In a sermon entitled "The True Notion of Persecution stated [in a sermon on 2 Cor. iv. 9, preached at the time of the late contribution for the French Protestants. Published at the earnest request of many who heard it. 1681." In this sermon Hickes distinguished between the English laws against non-conformists and Roman Catholics, and those of the French against the Huguenots, and endeavoured to remove the prejudices entertained against the refugees. At that time, shortly before the revocation of the edict of Nantes, the Huguenots emigrated in great numbers, and were encouraged to settle in England. Charles II., July 28, 1681, granted them letters of denization, relieved them from various payments, and encouraged voluntary contributions for their support.

Hickes refers to this sermon in the Letter to Dr. Turner of May 5, 1707; part of which was quoted note o, p. 57. "The great compassion I had for the French Protestants made me preach and publish my Sermon of Persecution twenty-five years since; in which I said all I could for them to remove a common objection against them, that they were of the same principles with our presbyterians, and as much enemies to the Church of England. In that sermon I think I have said nothing contrary to my principle, or if any kind expression leans, or seems to lean, towards favouring or approving their church and ministry, though I think there is none such, it must in equity pass for an unguarded expression, which slipped from me while my eye was wholly directed to the design I had to do them good."—Quoted in Gen. Dict., note to art. Hickes.]

[i] [This sermon the Editor has not seen.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XX.

not long ago preached and printed at Delf, in which the Church of England is so deeply concerned, perhaps would make some other men repent.

Thus much I have said in answer to my adversary; with all the tenderness for the Protestant Churches who plead necessity for their not having the episcopal government and ministry, for which many of their pastors have expressed great respect. But there is another Protestant Church which pleads not necessity to excuse their abdication of episcopacy, but declares it was their duty to cast it off, as an unlawful antichristian constitution, contrary to the word of God; and pursuant thereunto have more than once deposed their own bishops, forced some of them by persecution to renounce their episcopal function, and entered into a solemn league and covenant, which they still think obliging, to endeavour the destruction of it. If the ancient fathers who were saints and martyrs, were now living to see such a strange Church, how astonished would they stand at the sight of it, and with what holy indignation would they thunder against the iniquity of it, and charge the people to separate themselves from the ministry of it, as from Corah and his company, lest they perished with them in their sin. They would think such a pretended Church no better than a band of rebels against the Catholic Apostolic Church, and altogether unworthy of the name of a Church, as being not only an absolute variation from the Church of Christ as to its polity and mission, but a sworn confederacy against them, even "the abomination of desolation" in the house or kingdom of God; of which they would think their pastors not ministers, but by their old principles most malicious enemies; not pastors of the flock, but wolves; to many of both which, notwithstanding, I trust that God, who can make dispensations and allowances for the greatest ignorances, mistakes, and prejudices of His frail creatures, which men cannot make, will shew mercy in the great day, according to the prayer of our Lord upon the cross, "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do."

I have now answered the invidious objection of our worthy author against the necessity of the episcopal government, and now cannot but desire my readers to reflect a little with me

INSTITUTION OF BISHOPS.

on his great disingenuity, who loads us of this opinion with bitter invectives and opprobrious names, although he hath laid it down as the foundation of his whole work[j], "that all men, except atheists, have not only a natural freedom, but a strict natural right to believe and profess such speculative points as they think true, and to follow the dictates of their own understandings in all religious matters, to which," he saith, "the magistrate's power doth not extend." Yet without any consideration of us, or the antiquity and universality of our principles among Christians, and contrary to his own doctrine of natural right, he upbraids and ridicules us for it, though he knows we follow the dictates of our own consciences in believing and professing of it, and as much as in him lies, he endeavours to expose and theatrize us and our opinion, as it were to put us in the pillory with it written on our breasts, that that may be flouted, and we pelted for it by the mob. His disingenuity is no less observable in charging our principle with great seeming concern, as destructive to the presbyterian Church of Scotland; "those," saith he[k], "who are for episcopacy, *jure divino*, if they act and speak consistently with their opinion, can have no favourable opinion of the Revolution, whereby in Scotland the true Church, by the abolition of episcopacy, hath been destroyed." Good God! what stuff is this for a man to vent, who would be thought some great one among the writers against the Church; for first, why should not they who believe the Divine right of episcopacy, act, and speak, and write too, consistently with their opinion, which they have a natural right to believe and profess? Secondly, how can they help the consequences of their opinion, more than other men can help the consequences of theirs, "who," he saith, "must judge for themselves in matters of religion?" or more than he himself can help the consequences of his, whose opinion of Churches, and of the absurdities of the independent power, destroys the Scottish presbyterian Church, as effectually as the episcopal Church of England? I say the presbyterian Church of Scotland, which carries the independent power and all the absurdities he charges upon it, much higher than the highest flyers of the Church of England ever did, or now

[j] [Rights, pp. 14, 15.]

[k] Ibid., p. 315.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XX.

do? Lastly, what hath this opinion to do with the Revolution, more than that of the "high Scotized flyers" (pardon me for using one of his scurrilous names) among the presbyterians, who in both nations, by his way of reasoning, must have no favourable opinion of the Revolution, which hath continued the antichristian, unlawful episcopal form of government in the Church of England and Ireland, though never so contrary to the word of God? Doth he not know that men may like a government, and yet have no favourable opinion of some proceedings in it? Or hath he forgot what he saith[1], that in a society, and by consequence in all governments, men "must be determined, even in things they do not like, by the greater number, as having the greater force." But any turn of speech or fallacy will serve as an argument against the Church of England and her clergy, if it will expose them. He represents her hierarchy as the "spiritual Babylon," whose fall will be great; and notwithstanding all his declamations against persecution, he persecutes her and her loving and dutiful sons, through his whole book, even as [Ps. 137. 7.] the children of Edom did Jerusalem, when they said, "down with it, down with it, even to the ground." He will not allow her to maintain herself and her assemblies, neither by his natural, nor her own Divine right. In short, all her sons who derive not her power from the people, but God; all that are not, as he himself is, sons of Belial, or latitude, or disguise, he would, if he could, if he durst, take them; or make the people take them, as children of Babylon, and "dash them in pieces against the stones." I appeal to the strain of his whole book for the truth, at least for the probability of what I say; and indeed if they are such as he with all his art and malice represents them to be, they deserve but little better usage; if by principle they indeed are enslavers of mankind, and as certain of their poets said of us, with a love and respect like that of his,

"———Surcingle knaves,
Whose lives make atheists, and their doctrine slaves[m]."

SECT. XXI. Of an uninterrupted

His next objection is against "the bishops deriving their right by an uninterrupted succession of bishops in the

[1] Rights, p. 6.

[m] [The Editor has not been able to find from what work this quotation is made.]

Catholic Church." In answer to which I must observe, that, as he hath urged all the statutes of the realm against the Church of England, just as the popish writers have done, so like them also, and I have reason to believe with the same design, he hath drawn arguments against the succession of her bishops, who derive their succession from the Church of Rome, because we charge her with many grievous corruptions, and notwithstanding acknowledge her to be a true Church; which he pretends to prove is absurd for us to do, if she hath so many and such great faults as we accuse her of.

SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS.

succession of bishops in the Catholic Church.

He is not wanting in his usual rhetoric to expose us upon that account. "They have," saith he[n], "more favourable thoughts of the papists, whom they reverence as a true Church, than of the Protestant dissenters, whom they reckon no other than (the vilest thing in their eyes) a mere lay mob." This is one of the many kind strokes of his pen to halloo the mob upon us; and needs no other reflection. For every wise man knows, that though we own the Church of Rome for a true Church, it is purely in the metaphysical sense of the word, as true signifies real, and not in the moral sense. So the devil is a true angel or spirit, as true signifies verity of essence, though he is a lying spirit and the father of lies. So, in verity of essence, Judas was a true or real man, though he was a traitor and betrayed his Lord. He wants not learning to know this difference between true in a metaphysical, and true in a moral sense; and also knows very well that, although we own the Church of Rome for a true, that is, for a real Church, yet we have no reverence or veneration for her, as a corrupt degenerate Church; that very charge which he cannot but confess we lay upon her, and for which perhaps he is secretly angry at us, is a sufficient vindication of us from the odious imputation of our reverencing the Church of Rome. Should a man charge him with many and grievous corruptions in manners[o], and yet own him for a true, that is, a real Christian; I believe he would not thank him, or think himself much obliged to him, though he should profess to him and all the world at the same time, that notwithstanding the heavy charge he had brought and proved against him, he had a respect for

[n] Rights, p. 315.

[o] See note c, p. 163.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXI.

him, as a Christian man; and would it not be great injustice in others to treat that man as one that had a reverence for sinners, because he owned him for a Christian notwithstanding all the immoralities which he laid to his charge. He saith[p], 'that we allow the Church of Rome to be a true Church for no other reason than because, by our hypothesis of ecclesiastical government, we find it necessary for the support of our own.' But it is very well known, that we do not only allow her, and assert her to be so, but have proved it by such arguments as he cannot answer, notwithstanding the schism, and idolatry, and tyranny, and other corruptions which we lay to her charge. All his arguments upon this head, against us and the Church of England, were long since fully answered by Archbishop Laud, in his Conference with Fisher the Jesuit[q]; and lately by myself in the book cited in the margin[r], p. 79, and from p. 139 to p. 150. My adversary[s] had as subtle and sophistical a brain as Fisher, and as he dressed up Fisher in new clothes, so the author of the Rights hath dressed up him; and I refer the reader to my answer, to which my adversary hath never yet replied, and I challenge this Goliath, who defies and insults the clergy from the beginning of his preface to the end of his book, to make a reply to it if he can.

[p] Rights, p. 322.

[q] ["There is some (difference) between a *true* Church and a *right* Church, which is the word you use, ... that it is a true Church I granted, but not a right (one) .... for every thing that hath a being is truly that being which it is in truth of substance. .... A man that is most dishonest and unworthy the name, a very thief (if you will) is a true man in the verity of his essence, as he is a creature endued with reason; for this none can steal from him, nor he from himself, but death; but is not therefore a right, or an upright man. And a Church that is exceeding corrupt, both in manners and doctrine, and so is a dishonour to the name, is yet a true Church in the verity of essence, as a Church is a company of men which profess the faith of Christ and are baptized into His name, yet is it not therefore a right Church either in doctrines or manners."—Laud's Conference with Fisher, sect. 20. § 1, 2. pp. 104, 105. Oxford, 1839.]

[r] Several Letters, which passed between Dr. George Hickes, and a Popish Priest. London, printed for Richard Sare, 1705. [The first passage referred to, p. 79, almost repeats Laud's words. The second, pp. 139—150, pursues the same argument, instancing the Jewish Church, "which lost not its being as a Church notwithstanding its sins," the particular Churches mentioned in the 2nd and 3rd chapters of the Revelations, and the analogy of priests and baptized Christians, "who lose not their orders or their being as Christians by sin."]

[s] [His adversary was an unknown Romish priest, with whom he engaged in a conference for the purpose of convincing a lady who had gone over to the Roman Catholic communion. The subject was the infallibility, or rather, as Hickes says, "the indefectibility" of the Church.]

SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS.

As to the answer which Beza[t] made at the conference of Poissy to the objection which was brought against himself, and the Protestant ministers, for want of a mission, it is the same in substance with that which quakers, and anabaptists, and some other sectaries make to the same objection. And it is deplorable to consider that, from Beza to Mr. Claude[u], the French ministers would suffer themselves to be pressed with an objection, to which they could make no other answer but that 'gifts,' and 'a good life,' and 'sound doctrine,' and the 'election of the people,' was sufficient to a lawful and valid call to the ministry. I can assure our author that my Lord Chancellor Clarendon, whom he thinks he wittily calls the "favourite author of high Church[v]," did not think such a call with presbyterian ordination lawful, and for that reason never would communicate with the French Protestants, neither in his first or second being in France[x]. For which reason the famous Mr. Claude, the chief minister of Charenton[y], inveighed bitterly against him, and Dr. Morley,

[t] ["At the famous conference at Poissy, between the papists and protestants (Thuan. Hist., tom. ii. lib. 28. p. 45.) when the want of a call and authority was objected to the reformed ministers, Beza declared, that 'to a legitimate call, imposition of hands was not necessary; but that the chief and substantial tokens thereof were a good life, sound doctrine, and election (meaning of the people); nor was it to be wondered at, if they had not received imposition of hands from them whose corrupt life, superstition, and false doctrine they were to reprove. Or how could it be expected they should ever be allowed of by them who were enemies to the truth they defended?' After the same manner does the excellent Monsieur Claude and other Huguenot divines write."—Rights, p. 335. For the conference of Poissy, see note a, p. 272.]

[u] [As was said in the note last referred to, Beza, the successor of Calvin, was specially sent from Geneva to be present at Poissy. Claude had been pastor at Charenton, and the leading divine among the reformed from 1666, till the revocation of the edict of Nantes in 1685. The mention of Claude refers to the conference he had with Bossuet in 1678, (see note b, p. 272,) to whom his answer was, "Il a fallu quelquefois, et notamment de nos jours, où l'état de l'Eglise étoit interrompu, que Dieu suscitât gens d'une façon extraordinaire pour dresser de nouveau l'Eglise;" on Art. xxxi., De l'état interrompu de l'Eglise. See Bossuet's Reflections, &c. Œuvres completes, tom. xxiii. p. 416. See also the translation of Claude's work, entitled, "M. Claude's answer to Monsieur de Meaux's work, entitled a Conference with M. Claude," &c. London, 1687, pp. 55, 56. "It signifies nothing to allege, that they were possessed of the ministry by an external and ordinary succession . . . They enjoyed it by an external succession, it is confessed; but this succession, with respect to men's persons, continued no longer than we can say, the faithful are under their ministry. When we cannot be sure of that any more, from thenceforth the prelates have lost their right, and such a succession afterwards would be but as the succession of death to a disease, or of night to twilight."]

[v] Rights, p. 342.

[x] [Clarendon's first residence in France was from 1648 till the Restoration; the second, from his retirement and exile in December, 1667, till his death, Dec. 9, 1674.]

[y] [See note b, p. 272. Charenton was the place of worship for the

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXI.

and others, for refusing communion with them, in a discourse I had with him thirty-six years ago at his own house about their mission, too long to be recited here[z]. What he cites out of vol. ii. pp. 73—75, of that noble historian, is not at all for his purpose[a]. It neither proves the Church of Rome not to be a true Church, or the mission of the French ministers to be a valid mission, nor is it for the honour of the French Protestants, as any man may see, that will read the whole passage; but let his intention or malice be what it will in citing of it, he must permit me to refer him to another passage in that prince of historians, vol. iii. book xiii. pp. 345, 346[b]. I had rather for the sake of the French Protestants,

reformed of Paris. The edict of Nantes did not allow any of the Huguenot congregations within five leagues of the capital; Henry IV. relaxed the rule in this instance. Charenton is two leagues from Paris.]

[z] [Hickes had a similar conversation with Diodati at Geneva. See the letter to Dr. Turner, quoted note o, p. 57. "At Geneva I was invited to the Sacrament by M. Diodati, but not going, he told me he believed I absented as many English did who questioned their mission, and after that he grew cold and dry in his conversation with me. I believe by the English he meant my Lord Chancellor Clarendon and the English that were with him." Morley was one of these, being chaplain in Lord Clarendon's family during his first residence abroad at the time of the Rebellion.]

[a] [The passage referred to contains a review of the change in the conduct of the English Church and government towards the foreign Protestants: detailing the encouragements given them to settle in England, in the reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth, with a freedom to use their own forms of worship; and on the other hand the attempts on the part of the bishops in the reign of Charles I. to put them under some restraint: and again, the circumstance that the English ambassadors in France had been used to attend the worship of the reformed at Charenton, but afterwards declined doing so; and instead, had a chapel of their own, and the service of the English Church, with ornaments which were offensive to the foreign Protestants.

The passage to their disadvantage probably is, "The ambassador lieger at Paris had held a fair intercourse with those of that religion throughout the kingdom, by which they (the English) had still received advantage, that people being industrious and active to get into the secrets of the state, and so deriving all necessary intelligence to those whom they desired to gratify."—Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. iii. book vi. p. 363, sqq. Oxford, 1826. This is not quoted by Tindal.]

[b] [The passage is to this effect. When Charles II. was at Paris in 1652, the Protestant ministers pressed him much to attend their service at Charenton, which the queen his mother encouraged, "as the best expedient which might incline him, by degrees, to prefer the religion of the Church of Rome." Lord Jermyn urged it with the view of keeping up an interest with the presbyterians, and gaining the foreign Protestants; and there was the more hope of prevailing, in consequence of the recent death of Dr. Steward, who had had great influence over the king. The chancellor of the exchequer, however (Clarendon), strongly dissuaded him from it, urging that whatever professions the Huguenots might have made previously, "they had generally, as soon as the troubles begun, expressed great malice to the late king, and very many of their preachers and ministers had publicly and industriously justified the Rebellion, and prayed for the good success of it; and their synod itself had inveighed in such a manner against the Church of England ... and against episcopacy, as if it were inconsistent with the Protestant religion ... that his going there would not be without this effect, that it would be concluded everywhere, that his majesty thought the one or the other profession to be

SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS.

any body should have the mortification of transcribing it than myself. But if he pleases to consult it, there he will find that his lordship was "an high-flyer of the Laudean faction," as he terms it, who thought[c], that "there could not be a more deadly wound to the Church of England, than to have it thought indifferent whether one were of the presbyterian, or of her communion."

I do not think myself obliged to answer what he hath transcribed out of the bishop of Sarum's Exposition upon the twenty-third Article[d], for some reasons. First, because I think what I have already written in my two letters, and in this preface, may pass for an answer to it. And secondly, because his lordship's exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles hath received[e] some censure already in the lower house of

indifferent; and that there could not be a more deadly wound," &c., as in the text.—vol. vi. p. 575. Oxford, 1826.]

[c] [See last note.]

[d] ["The twenty-third article is so far from confining the power of making ministers to bishops, that it only in general terms declares 'ministers are to be sent by those who have public authority,' without determining who they are; because the Church, as the bishop of Sarum observes, 'supposes they might be different in different places,' and therefore allowed all Protestants who separated from Rome, though ever so widely differing in their notions of Church government and the power of ordination, to be true Churches."—Rights, p. 339. This is but the substance of Bishop Burnet's statements. See Exposition of the xxxix Articles, pp. 345, &c. Oxford, 1819.]

[e] In the humble representation of the lower house, May 30, 1701. After which the house drew up a paper of specialities, which was not received by the upper house.

[May 30, 1701. The lower house of convocation presented to the bishops the following representation respecting the bishop of Sarum's Exposition of the xxxix Articles.

"To the most reverend father in God Thomas lord archbishop of Canterbury, and to the right reverend the bishops his suffragans. The humble representation of the lower house of convocation.

Whereas a book hath been lately published entituled, an Exposition of the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England, by Gilbert lord bishop of Sarum, which the author declares to have passed the perusal of both the archbishops, and several bishops and learned divines, and suggests their approbation of it: and whereas we think it our duty, as much as in us lies, to secure the doctrine contained in those articles from any attempts that may be made against them: we most humbly offer to your grace and your lordships, the sense of this house; which is as follows;

1. That the said book tends to introduce such a latitude and diversity of opinions, as the articles were framed to avoid.

2. That there are many passages in the exposition of several articles, which appear to us to be contrary to the true meaning of them, and to other received doctrines of our Church.

3. That there are some things in the said book which seem to us to be of dangerous consequence to the Church of England as by law established, and to derogate from the honour of its Reformation.

All which particulars we humbly lay before your lordships, praying your opinion herein."

At first this paper could not be received, owing to a resolution of the upper house not to receive any thing from the lower till an alleged irregularity were set right.

In the next session however, June 6, at the earnest request of the bishop himself, the paper was brought up, and

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXI.

convocation, from men whom I look upon as not inferior to his lordship in the study of true divinity. And thirdly, because his exposition on the twenty-third article, which my adversary cites, hath received at least one solid answer[f], to which, with submission to his lordship, and with all respect to him, I think he stands still indebted for a just and full reply. But though I decline making an answer to what is cited by the author of the Rights out of that exposition, yet with all humility I beg leave, for my better information and

after being read over and considered by the archbishop and bishops, the archbishop said, "Your paper of complaint against my lord of Sarum's book does contain only generals; and therefore we must require you to bring up the specialties or particulars of your charge against that book." Whilst this was preparing by the lower house, a committee of bishops had come to the following resolutions.

"In relation to the complaint and censure of the bishop of Sarum's Exposition of the XXXIX Articles, made by the lower house and presented to the archbishop and bishops on May 30th, 1701;

I. It is our opinion, that the lower house of convocation has no manner of power judicially to censure any book.

II. That the lower house of convocation ought not to have entered upon the examination of a book of any bishop of this Church without first acquainting the president and bishops with it.

III. That the lower house of convocation's censuring the book of the bishop of Sarum in general terms, without mentioning the particular passages on which the censure is grounded, is defamatory and scandalous.

IV. That the bishop of Sarum by his excellent History of the Reformation, approved by both houses of parliament, and other writings, hath done great service to the Church of England, and justly deserves the thanks of this house.

V. That though private persons may expound the articles of the Church, yet it cannot be proper for the convocation at this time to approve, much less to condemn, such private expositions."

At the next session, June 20, the prolocutor of the lower house appeared holding in his hands two several papers, and offering to deliver both of them; to which the president replied that he could receive no paper from him but that containing the particularities of the general charge against the bishop of Sarum's Exposition of the XXXIX Articles, which at the request of the said bishop he was now ready to receive. The prolocutor however said he was not authorized to present one paper without the other: nor was any further step taken when the convocation, after successive prorogations, was dissolved.—See Kennett's History of England, vol. iii. pp. 846—850; and also, "A narrative of the proceedings of the lower house of convocation, &c., drawn up by order of the house," London, 4to. 1701: and, "The history of the convocation, &c., faithfully drawn from the journal of the upper, and from the narrative and minutes of the lower house," London, 1701.

Burnet, after giving the heads of the representation, adds, "What the particulars to which these general heads referred, were, could never be learned; this was a secret lodged in confiding hands: I begged that the archbishop would dispense with the order made against further communications with the lower house, as to this matter; but they would enter into no particulars, unless they might at the same time offer some other matters, which the bishops would not admit of."—Own Times, vol. ii. p. 285. fol.]

[f] [The works which Hickes refers to are, "A Vindication of the 23rd Article from a late exposition ascribed to my Lord Bishop of Sarum." London, 1702. (The work is attributed to Mr. William Thornton, principal of Hart Hall.) And "The Reasonableness of a Toleration of those of the Episcopal Persuasion enquired into, purely on Church principles," by Bp. Sage; Edinburgh, 1705. See p. 319, and note o, p. 290.]

satisfaction, to ask his lordship a few questions. First, whether his lordship's latitude-exposition of the twenty-third article, concerning the lawful calling and mission of ministers, be agreeable to the stricter expressions of the Church in other places; as particularly in her Form and Manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and the Preface thereunto. In the former it is the bishop only that gives authority to the deacon, and commits the sacerdotal power to the priest by the imposition of his, with the presbyters', hands, giving him authority to preach, and administer the Sacraments, and loose sinners in the name of the Father, &c. So in the consecration of a bishop, the person consecrated to the episcopal order and office hath all the power of it committed unto him by the imposition of the hands of the consecrating bishops: and in the preface the Church declares, first, that 'these three offices have been in the Church of Christ from the time of the Apostles;' and secondly, "that they were evermore had in such reverend estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, &c., and also, by public prayer with imposition of hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority." And thirdly, "that no man shall be accounted, or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, &c., and admitted thereunto according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination." So in the Act for Uniformity, 14 Carol. II., which seconds and confirms the order of the Church, it is enacted, "that no person whatsoever shall be capable to be admitted to any parsonage, &c., or any ecclesiastical promotion or dignity, nor shall presume to administer the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, before such time as he shall be ordained priest according to the form and manner in and by the said book prescribed, unless he have formerly been made priest by episcopal ordination." So in the Canons[g], whenever there is mention of ordination, there is also mention of bishops, as in Canons 31, 32, 33, 34. So in the Articles for the Clergy

SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS.

[g] [A.D. 1604.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXI.

made by the province of Canterbury, 1584[h], the first article, which provides that none but fit persons shall be admitted to holy orders, supposes that none but bishops could ordain, as in those expressions, *Quod si vero aliquis episcopus aliquem ad sacros ordines admiserit; Ne quis episcopus aliquem in beneficium instituat*, &c.

These observations being premised, I desire to ask his lordship in the second place, whether these things ought not to have been his lordship's rule in his exposition of the "lawful authority" mentioned in the twenty-third article, which in the Preface to the Form and Manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating, &c., can signify nothing but the episcopal authority, to which it is there restrained. Thirdly, I desire to know, that if our Church owns such ordinations and missions as his lordship mentions in his exposition, as lawful and valid; with what consistency to herself, or to that correspondence, fellowship, and communion which ought to be among Christian Churches, she can so positively refuse to let the ministers of other Protestant Churches execute their ministerial office, or have any ministerial charge within her pale, before they are episcopally ordained? Fourthly, I desire to know whether our reformers, and their successors not (expressly) "questioning," condemning, or annulling the ordinations and missions of the ministers of the other Protestant Churches "for eighty years," as his lordship saith[i], amounts to an argument that they owned and approved them? If so, then I would ask, whether the non-concurrence of the upper house of convocation with the lower to censure his lordship's Exposition be an approving of the same[j]? Fifthly, I desire to know if the authority of the clergy, who have questioned the lawfulness of their ordinations and missions, and utterly excluded them from ministering in our Church, since the term of those eighty years mentioned by his lordship, be not as good an argument against their ministry, as the not questioning of it before that time was for

[h] [Articuli per archiepiscopum episcopos et reliquum clerum Cantuarensis provinciæ in synodo inchoatæ Londini, Nov. 24, 1584. . . . stabiliti, &c.—Wilkins' Concilia, vol. iv. p. 315.]

[i] ["Neither our reformers, nor their successors for near eighty years after those articles were published, did ever quesion the constitution of such Churches."—Burnet, Exposition; Art. xxiii. p. 349.]

[j] [See note d, p. 285, 286.]

it. Sixthly, I desire to know if God hath not appointed one priesthood for the one universal Church of Christians dispersed through the whole world, as He did for the one particular Church of the Jews; and if He did, whether another priesthood of a private man's setting up in a family, as that of Micah was, or another public priesthood, as that of Jeroboam's setting up in a kingdom for "politic reasons" of state, are more justifiable in the Christian than in the Jewish Church? I ask this question, because I cannot yet think, as his lordship doth, that we are "at liberty, as to our thoughts, concerning the subject of that lawful authority[k]" which is to call, send, and ordain men to the ministry in the Christian Church.

SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS.

[Judges 17. 12.] [1 Kings 12. 27.]

I might ask many more questions; as whether, if one Micah cannot make a lawful priest, an hundred or thousand Micahs together can make one[l]? and whether the men who let themselves be made priests by Micah and King Jeroboam, did not commit as great a sin as they who made them priests? I might also ask if one place, country, or kingdom, which wants a lawful priesthood, (I mean, priests ordained by the authority of God's appointing,) ought not, after the example of the Bohemians[m], to send all over the world, and fetch priests of such a priesthood, like the most precious merchandise, from the remotest countries? and if they ought, whether there ever[n] was or can be such a neces-

[k] ["That no man enter upon any part of the holy ministry 'without he be chosen, and called by such as have an authority so to do,' that, I say, is fixed by this article; but men are left more at liberty as to their thoughts concerning the subject of this lawful authority."—Ibid., p. 345.]

[l] [Burnet's words are, "If a company of Christians" (under circumstances of supposed necessity, see note p, in the next page,) "should by a common consent desire some of their own number to minister to them in holy things . . . . if this necessity is real and not feigned, this is not condemned or annulled by this Article."—Ibid., p. 347.]

[m] [The Unitas Fratrum of the Bohemians and Moravians, after they had separated from the communion of the Church, convened a synod in 1467, to deliberate on the means of maintaining a regular succession of ministers. They resolved to use every possible means to obtain episcopal consecration, and sent three priests to the only Christians, so far as they knew, from whom they could receive it; these were the Waldenses, who professed to have the episcopal succession, and had now some congregations and a bishop, called Stephen, in Austria. He, assisted by another bishop, consecrated them.—See Holmes' History of the Moravians, vol. i. pp. 50—54.]

[n] Rich. Montacutii Episcopi Norwicensis Originum Ecclesiasticarum Tomi prioris pars posterior, p. 463, 464. [London, 1640. Credimus, accurate tuemur et defendimus . . . Sacerdotium rite delegatum, esse, fuisse, futurum esse, ordinem illum in ecclesia sacerdotalem in ecclesia visibili constitutum, agnitum, agnoscendumve; . . . Hoc ipsum officium et munus in Ecclesia, sive Apostolicum sive sacer-

sity[o] for kings or people to make ministers, as his lordship supposeth[p]? or allowing that there was such a necessity, whether, the necessity ceasing, those ministers made in that necessity, and their ministry, did not cease with it? because the law of necessity, from which his lordship argues, can last no longer than the necessity itself[q]. I also beg leave to ask his lordship, whether that case happening in any Christian country, where 'kings or states are jealous of their subjects

dotale, adeo esse de necessitate salutis ordinaria, ut sine altero alterum esse nequeat. Non est sacerdotium nisi in Ecclesia; non est Ecclesia sine sacerdotio. Illud autem intelligo, per χειροθεσίαν episcopalem ordinariam. Neque enim admittendam censemus extraordinariam aliquam seu vocationem, seu λειτουργίαν, nisi miraculosam. Oportet omnino miraculis agant, et suam confirment functionem signo aliquo, qui non ab episcopis, derivata ab Apostolis per successionem institutione, in Ecclesiam inducuntur. . . Nam quod prætendunt, ordinariam vocationem retinendam, adhibendam, eique adhærescendum, *nisi in casu necessitatis*, absurdum est, et suppositioni nititur impossibilitatis. Neque enim talis casus, aut extitit aliquando, aut contingere potest: nisi fallat nos Dominus, qui promisit, 'Portæ inferorum non prævalebunt, Ecce sum vobiscum ad consummationem mundi.']

[o] The Reasonableness of Toleration, &c. Letter v. p. 208. [The title of this book was, The Reasonableness of a Toleration of those of the Episcopal Persuasion inquired into purely on Church Principles. With a brief Examination of some things in Mr. Meldrum's Sermon preached on the 6th of May, 1703, against a toleration to those of the Episcopal persuasion, A. D. 1704. It was written by Bp. Sage. See Memoir of the life and times of the Right Rev. John Sage, prefixed to his Works, vol. i. p. lv. Edinburgh, printed for the Spottiswoode Society, 1844. Bishop Sage was pleading for the toleration of episcopacy in Scotland, which was not legally tolerated till 1712. See note h, p. 299.

Bp. Sage says, "IX. Episcopacy, though even of Divine institution, is not always absolutely necessary. To be absolutely necessary for salvation is one thing; and to be absolutely necessary for the due constitution of an organized visible Church is another. . . . As I have already hinted, a necessity wilfully and undutifully made by one's-self can never be honestly pleaded to be a just necessity. . . . You have undutifully kicked out of doors those who had the power of ordination: and then you plead necessity, and that you must ordain without them."—p. 219.

See also pp. 204, 205. "(4.) I cannot see how that which is quite out of all rule, till it be rectified, can ever grow up to a duly regulated constitution. I think the common axiom, 'Non firmatur tempore quod ab initio non subsistit,' is founded on eternal and unalterable reason. Neither (5.) am I persuaded that there ever was such a necessity as might justify such a presumption. . . . When priests duly ordained are wanting, I think the common doctrine of Protestants about the 'no absolute necessity of Sacraments' should be remembered, and laics ought to worship together, and edify one another the best way they can, but always keeping within their own sphere, and humbly waiting till God shall provide them persons duly consecrated. . . . And even making the hard supposition that in such matters necessity can justify extraordinary and irregular steps, yet this must be allowed, that cases of necessity can hold no longer than the necessity continues. And this too, that necessity can never excuse those who inexcusably make it."]

[p] ["If a company of Christians find the public worship where they live to be so defiled, that they cannot with a good conscience join in it, and if they do not know of any place to which they can conveniently go, where they may worship God purely and in a regular way."—Burnet, Exposition, ibid. This was the necessity referred to in the extract in note l, p. 289.]

[q] [Burnet had said "when this (irregular beginning) grows to a constitution, it was acknowledged," &c.—Exposition, ibid.]

going elsewhere for regular ordinations[r];' I say, I desire to know whether that case happening in any part of Christendom just as his lordship describes it[r], be not the same with the case of Jeroboam and his priests, or very like it? I desire also to be informed by his lordship, whether that or any other case of necessity, when it authorizes a company of Christian people, or the supreme magistrate over them, (let their 'whole body and wills be never so much comprehended and concluded in him[s],') to constitute ministers, it also authorizes them to sink or suppress any order of the ministry, especially the supreme order of bishops? Methinks it must be a strange necessity that authorizes men to set up a ministry in part, and not in whole; to supply the want of the ordinary mission, and not to supply it in perfection: Jeroboam, who for the same "political reasons" which his lordship allows[t], set up priests of his own creation, made high-priests as well as priests. I might ask his lordship more questions, but I will conclude, most humbly beseeching him to consider, whether instead of writing up the other Protestant Churches to the Church of England, as one would think a bishop should do, he hath not written her down to them in his Exposition of the twenty-third Article, and upon supposition (for things may be supposed that never will be) that episcopacy should be abdicated for politic reasons here as in other countries, what his lordship could say, after such large concessions, in defence of his own most sacred apostolic order, why it should not be deposed. He hath observed of it[u], that 'the world received the Christian religion with [under] it, that all the corners of the Christian Church,' and 'all the parts of it, the sound as well as the unsound, that is, the orthodox as well as the heretics and schismatics, agreed in it.' His lord-

SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS.

[r] ["If it should happen that princes or states should take up such a jealousy of their own authority, and should apprehend that the suffering their subjects to go elsewhere for regular ordinations, might bring them under some dependence on those that had ordained them; and if upon other political reasons they had just cause of being jealous of that, and should thereupon hinder any such thing in that case, neither our Reformers nor their successors for near eighty years after those articles were published did ever question the constitution of such Churches." —Ibid., p. 349.]

[s] ["The prince or supreme power comprehends virtually the whole body of the people in him: since according to the constitution of the civil government, the wills of the people are understood to be concluded by the supreme."—Burnet, ibid., p. 346.]

[t] Exposition, p. 349. [See above, note r.]

[u] Pref. to the Life of Will. Beddel, bishop of Kilmore. [London, 1685. The work was written by Bishop Burnet.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXI.

ship also observes, that it was the government of the Church, when 'the fury of persecution, which always was the bishop's portion, made it no desirable thing to be a bishop; and in a course of many centuries, when nothing but poverty and labour was got by the employment,' and when "there were no princes to set it on as an engine of government, and no synods of clergymen gathered to assume that authority to themselves, by joint designs and endeavours." "And can it be imagined," saith he, "that in all that glorious cloud of witnesses to the truth of the Christian religion, who as they planted it with their labours, so watered it with their blood, there should not be [so much as] one single person found on whom either a love to truth, or envy at the advancement of others prevailed so far, as to declare against such an early and universal corruption (if it is to be esteemed one). When all this is complicated together, it is really of so great authority, that I love not to give the proper name to that temper that can withstand so plain a demonstration." This is his lordship's character of episcopacy, and I cannot but think, that a government so set up, and so universally received by all Christians, and in all Churches, deserves to be thought not only not criminal, but necessary, as a Divine institution not alterable by the will of men; and that it ought not to be given up to men of that temper his lordship then had in his eye, or to be sacrificed to "politic reasons," or the interest and ambition of any mortal, or the humour of an ignorant, deceived, or otherwise stubborn and obstinate people. I think we ought rather to bear our testimony for it unto blood[x].

But to go on, our author, in his last chapter[y], hath rather

[x] [Hickes doubtless had in view the giving up episcopacy in Scotland by William III., for politic reasons, his own interest, and the humour of the people. According to Burnet, William answered an application from the Church, "that he would do all he could to preserve them, granting a full toleration to the presbyterians; but this was, in case they concurred in the new settlement of the kingdom. If they opposed that, and if, by a great majority in parliament, resolutions should be taken against them, the king could not make a war for them;" but "they declaring in a body with so much zeal in opposition to the new settlement, it was not possible for the king to preserve that government there; all those who expressed their zeal for him, being equally zealous against that order."—Own Times, vol. ii. p. 23. fol.]

[y] [Rights, chap. x. of which the subject is "that the Catholic Church consists of several bodies independent on each other: and that none of these have power to make clergy except for themselves; and that the contrary necessarily supposes a universal bishop or pope."]

outdone than fallen short of himself in bold assertions, and in spiteful and scurrilous expressions and reflections upon the clergy; and though others think he hath written it, as the rest of his book, with a design to confound all revealed religion as much he can, except what the Unitarians own; yet considering who the author is, I am of opinion it is written rather with a design to destroy the Church of England, and serve the interests of the Church of Rome, to which he either went over, or was going over in the reign of the late King James. And I think it is impossible for a serious man to read it, without suspecting that he is either a theist or a papist in his heart. That which he undertakes to prove in it is, "that the Catholic Church consists of several bodies, as independent on each other as so many several states or kingdoms, and that none of them hath power to make clergymen but for themselves." His first argument is a simile[z]: "If they," saith he, "who have the supreme temporal power in one country cannot give one a right to exercise any civil jurisdiction, or even any ministerial office in another not subject to them, the reason is equally concluding as to ecclesiasticals. And by the same reason, he who is excommunicated in one national Church is no more so in any other than one who is outlawed in one country is so in others." If he had pleased, he might with as much boldness, and as little truth or proof, have asserted, that as he who is born in one country hath no right by virtue of his birth to the particular privileges of another, so a man baptized in one Christian national Church hath no right to communion in another; or that he who is made a member of the Church in one nation is not thereby made a member of the Church in another, much less of all the national Churches in the world. But this he thought was too plain, to deny Christians of one country the rights of their baptism in another; Christians of all national Churches still believing and professing, as Christians have believed from the beginning, that the several Churches all the world over make up but one Catholic Church, of which Christ alone is the head. He saw plainly that his new assertion was directly contrary to the constant notion that all Christians, in all ages and places, ever had of

[z] Rights, p. 378, [in substance.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXII.

the nature of the universal Church, as of one body made up of several members; and therefore, saith he[a], "to avoid these consequences it is said, that every nation is not a complete body politic within itself as to ecclesiasticals, but the whole Church, say they, composes such a body, and Christ is the head of it." Here, as is usual with him, he couches several equivocal expressions and fallacies together; for if by 'every nation' he means every national Church, who is it that saith every national Church, or a Church when it is national, is not a complete body politic within itself? or who will not allow every Church, whether national or not national, to be as complete a body within itself as every college in Oxford is, though but a part of that greater society and more noble body the university, of which the chancellor is the head? Those who assert that all the national Churches in the world make up one universal Church, not only own them, but every diocesan Church in them to be complete bodies under their several bishops, though neither they, nor the national Church consisting of them, when there are more Churches, is the whole Catholic Church, of which Christ alone is the head; indeed, no more than all the companies or sodalities of London, each of which is a complete society in itself, is the whole body of the city, of which my lord mayor is head. Here I cannot but note his expression, "say they;" the "whole Church, say they, composes such a body;" and who are they that say so? Even the whole Church that composes such a body hath ever said it, whatever he saith to the contrary now. But still he will go on[b]; "Christ's headship," saith he, "makes Christians no more one body politic with respect to ecclesiasticals than to civils. His precepts equally extend to both, and the whole earth is God's and Christ's kingdom; and yet the kingdoms of the earth are distinct and independent of one another, and so are all national Churches." Here is still the same assertion again in other words, with some show of proof, viz., that national Churches are as distinct and independent of one another as so many several worldly kingdoms and commonwealths. In answer to which I must observe, first, that as to the notion of the Catholic Church, and Christ's headship over it, it is purely accidental,

[a] Rights, p. 380.

[b] [Ibid.]

whether the particular Churches which are members of it be national or not national, or whether any one of them be in one and the same nation or dominion or in several: for as the parochial churches often happen to be in two civil jurisdictions, as in London and Westminster, and dioceses in two or three different counties, so the same provincial, nay, diocesan Churches, may be in different nations, and the particular Churches, which make up the whole Catholic Church, be they national or not national, in one or several countries or kingdoms, they are all parts of the same body of which Christ is the head. Secondly, I must observe that all the parts of the whole Catholic Church, of which it is made one body, are parts of the same name and nature with one another and with the whole; or that the Catholic Church is one homogeneous body, consisting of parts of the same name and nature with one another and with the whole; in which respect it differs vastly from the kingdoms, states, and republics of the earth, which have different names, and different civil natures, and constitutions perfectly independent of each other, and which for that reason are not incorporate or united into one body, as particular Churches national or not national are, as having the same priesthood, the same fundamental laws, the same discipline, the same privileges and rights, and the same rewards and punishments one as the other; which the several kingdoms, states, and republics of the world have not; and therefore though they all have God, God I say, for their sovereign Lord and Head in heaven, as several independent kingdoms and other dominions have the kings of Spain for their earthly sovereign, yet as he speaks, they are not thereby united with respect to civils, but notwithstanding the supreme dominion and headship of God over them, they all still remain distinct and independent sovereignties vastly different from each other in their respective constitutions and rights. But it is not so in the Churches that are in the world, which being only lesser societies or parts of the same nature and constitution, are perfectly united and incorporated together into the one whole great body politic of the Catholic Church, under their one common Lord and Head, Christ.

Having given the reason, from the sameness of nature in

all the parts of the Catholic Church as in the whole, why Christians all the world over make one body politic in ecclesiasticals, though not in civils; I proceed to examine the two arguments he brings to prove the contrary. First, he saith, "Christ's precepts equally extend to both;" which is so far from being true that it is notoriously false. For Christ, as Head of the Church, hath given it many peculiar ecclesiastical precepts and commands, as God gave to the Jewish Church, which He hath not given to the empires, kingdoms, and states of the world; and obliged it as a spiritual society to many peculiar duties and offices in all places, to which He hath not obliged them, otherwise than as Christian; but not as civil societies, not as empires, kingdoms, and states. Secondly, he saith, "the whole earth is God's and Christ's kingdom." To which I answer, that the whole earth, and all the kingdoms and other civil dominions of it, are God's and Christ's kingdom, as God, but not as Messias or Christ. For, as Christ, He is head of no kingdoms, but as they are His Churches, as it is written, "He is the head of the body the Church, and God hath given Him to be head over all things to the Church, from whom the whole body (even all its members) fitly framed together, and compacted by that which every member supplieth, maketh increase of the body, or maketh the body grow and increase, unto the edification of itself in love." I desire our author now to consider, if the temporal sovereignties of the world be thus compacted and joined together to Christ, or even to God, as their politic head, and whether Christians and Christian Churches in all the world, called here the joints or members of the body of Christ, are no more one body politic in ecclesiasticals, under the headship of Christ, than they are in civils. I would also pray him to consider some other places, as where Christ is described as the spouse and husband of the whole Church; but is He the spouse of any one kingdom, as it is a kingdom, or civil society? Or do all the kingdoms, as the Churches of the earth, make up one kingdom, or one body politic with Him, of which He is the head, as the husband is of his wife. Farthermore is He the founder and head of empires, states, and kingdoms, and other temporal principalities, as the Scripture saith He is of the Church, or in the same capacity and

respect? Are they described in Scripture as members of His body, or are they collectively said to be His body, as the whole Church is, or members of it, as particular Churches are also said to be? Lastly, can it be said of them, or any of them, that as temporal societies they are "the house and household of God, the city of God," or "the kingdom of God," or that they "are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom the whole building fitly framed together maketh an holy temple unto the Lord?" If as temporal societies they are His house, then unbelieving empires and kingdoms are His houses too, and as such are built upon the foundation of the Apostles, of which He is the corner-stone. More particularly, I would beseech our author to consider, whether the character and description of Christ's one kingdom in the Gospel can belong to the independent kingdoms of the world collectively considered, or to any one of them, though never so great? Or whether the subjects of His kingdom, and provinces, or other districts of it, in which they are scattered over the whole earth, in far distant, differently constituted, and independent temporal sovereignties, are no more united under Him in ecclesiasticals than in civils? If they are no more united in those than in these, they have no politic union at all, they are not parts joined and compacted together into one body, they are not edified as living stones into one building, nor have any relation to one another as members of the same body, or parts of the same whole. On the contrary, Christians every where are brethren of the same Family, members of the same Corporation, citizens of the same City, subjects of the same Kingdom, and the several Churches in which they communicate, though antipodes to one another, though in countries of never so different polities, customs, languages, and government, are but as apartments of the same house, as wards of the same city, as towns, hundreds, shires, provinces of the same spiritual kingdom under one ecclesiastical economy and administration, whereof Christ is the author as well as sovereign Lord and Head. The wit of man cannot devise apter similitudes or comparisons to set forth the unity of any society, than those I have cited out of the New Testament, to prove the union of all the Churches

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXII.

in the world into one Catholic Church. And as the Church is one, so it hath one priesthood, one faith, one baptism, and in this one universal Church it is that all faithful Christians are of one Communion, according to that article in the Creed, I believe [in] the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints. But this man, without any regard to Scripture, Creeds, or the voice of Christianity itself, being resolved to have many independent churches in the world of natural right, instead of one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church of Divine right, he ridiculously attempts to batter down her ecclesiastical unity with some of the same artillery that he planted before against the power and priesthood of the clergy, viz., with the statute 25 Hen. VIII[d]., which he discharges again against the necessity of episcopal ordination, in behalf of the people's natural right to make their own Church governors, and unmake them at their pleasure. Saith he[e], "It is notorious that with us (and so it was every where formerly, as I shall prove hereafter) the bishops act ministerially, being under no less penalty than a præmunire obliged to confirm and consecrate the person named in the congè d'élire." Again, speaking of the power of ordination, as inherent in the bishops, he objects[f] once more against it, "as inconsistent with the magistrate's authorizing any two, or three bishops, or even any single bishop to lay hands upon him, and by consequence the power is derived from the magistrate, . . . and it is he who empowers them," &c. Again, "with us," saith he[g], "(and it is the same in other Protestant countries which have bishops,) nothing can be plainer, than that the bishops act ministerially, and by virtue of the regal commission, by which the prince firmly 'enjoins and commands them, on the fidelity by which they are bound to him, to proceed according to the form of the statutes in choosing, confirming, and consecrating.' Strange words," saith he, "for one who is supposed to be a subject to them, but more strange, that the disobeying him is under no less penalty

[d] [§ 7. "If any archbishop or bishop, after such election, nomination, or presentation shall be signified unto them by the king's letters patents, shall refuse and do not confirm, invest, and consecrate with all due circumstance as aforesaid, within twenty days next after the king's letters patents of such signification or presentation shall come into their hands; or if any of them, or any other person or persons, admit or do any other thing contrary to the statute, in such case every person so offending, their aiders, counsellors and abettors, shall incur a præmunire."]

[e] Rights, c. x. § 10. pp. 387, 388.

[f] Ibid., § 13. p. 389.

[g] Ibid., § 14. p. 390.

than a præmunire[h], a greater punishment than the civil ministers suffer for not obeying the royal mandate." The words and the punishment shall be as strange as he pleases, and truly I once heard as eminent a lawyer as any of his time, speak of them as very strange, but with a much better intention than he. Indeed I think every serious Christian, who reflects, not only upon the doctrine and practice of the purest ages of Christianity as to the episcopal power, particularly in ordination, but upon the first article in the charter[i] of Hen. I., and the first article of the Great Charter[j], must think both very strange as well as other things which lawgivers of all countries sometimes enact. And I cannot but ask our author, who derives the ecclesiastical power of the magistrate from the people, whether before the empire turned Christian, the people authorized bishops to consecrate and ordain? and whether in ordaining, they then acted ministerially under them, or by virtue of any commission from them? and whether they were indispensably bound to consecrate or ordain the person they chose? and whether if they did not, the people, nay the people and presbyters together, could command them on their fidelity or duty to them, or in any other form of authority, to proceed according to their election to consecrate or ordain? or if they disobeyed, to suspend, or deprive them, which then would have been punishments much stranger than the præmunire now is? Thus much

[h] See Greenshield's Petition. [The Rev. James Greenshields was a clergyman who had received his orders from the ejected bishop of Ross, and officiated in Ireland. He came to Edinburgh in the year 1709, and performed Divine service there, using the English (in contradistinction to the Scottish) liturgy, and praying for the queen and the princess Sophia. On this he was summoned by the presbytery of Edinburgh, and forbidden to officiate; and continuing to do so, was committed to the Tolbooth by the magistrates, "till he should find surety to desist from the exercise of his ministry." On this he appealed to the Lords of Council and Session; but the application was rejected on the ground that he "was not a minister, having been ordained by an exauctorate bishop." On this he presented a petition to them arguing this point; 'that deprivation by the civil power does not take away the spiritual powers of a bishop.' The petition was printed in a pamphlet intitled, "A True State of the Case of Mr. Greenshields," &c., with copies of several original papers, &c., London, 1710. The argument is throughout to the same effect as Hickes', but probably the passage referred to is p. 26, where he says "imprisonment, being the restraint of natural liberty, is amongst the severest of arbitrary punishments and no ways founded in law; but to imprison and to incarcerate a person sine die (an exact description of præmunire) is contrary to law, and is one of the grievances complained of in the claim of Rights." (See also Case of Mr. Greenshields, pp. 7, 8. 1710.) Greenshields afterwards applied to the House of Lords, and after many delays was ordered to be released, March 1710-11.]

[i] Matth. Paris, Sanctam Dei Ecclesiam liberam facio.—[Matt. Paris Historia, A.D. 1100, p. 46. London, 1684.]

[j] [See note o, p. 139.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXII.

upon this occasion I thought fit to propose to our author, upon his scheme of forming independent Churches over the whole world, "no more united in ecclesiasticals than in civils."

But to proceed, though I think I have sufficiently answered this crambe objection already, I think fit to say something more to it by way of question to our author. As first, whether our bishops, for instance, derive their sacerdotal power of consecration from our kings and queens in the same manner and meaning as other civil and military officers do, solely by virtue of the royal commission, and act ministerially under them and by their authority, just as these also do, purely as ministers of the crown, and not as ministers authorized and appointed by God? Though he must answer in the affirmative, according to his own scheme of Church government, and hath expressly said it in his Preface, p. xlix[k], yet for method's sake I am forced to ask this, in order to the next question, whether our kings and queens, as other supreme magistrates, (who, he saith, derive all their power from the people[l],) could, if they were not otherwise limited by statute-law, commission and authorize two or three of the laity, imagine his worthy self, and Mr. T[oland] and A[sgill][m], to consecrate a bishop? The reason I ask this is obvious. For if all ecclesiastical authority, and particularly this of consecrating bishops, is, like all other civil power, vested by the people in the crown, and from thence again derived; the queen, if not otherwise limited, might indifferently authorize any men to do that office, as well as bishops, which I presume none but such a profligate as himself will affirm. In the third place, I desire to know of him, whether the supreme magistrate, particularly a king or queen of England in person, may consecrate bishops, or ordain priests, or exercise other sacerdotal functions? The reason of this question is also plain. For if, as he asserts[n], all ecclesiastical power, and particularly this of consecration, be derived from the supreme magistrate, or, as we commonly say, from the crown, as all civil and military power certainly is; and if the bishops appointed and authorized by the royal commission to

[k] ["Though our princes can no more judge in person, than exercise the ecclesiastical function, yet that does not hinder but all the judges, ecclesiastical and civil, derive their power from them."—Rights, Pref., p. xliv.]

[l] [Ibid., Introduction, p. 2, &c.]

[m] [See notes f, g, p. 51.]

[n] Rights, Preface, p. xliv.

consecrate, act 'ministerially,' in the same sense of the word that other civil and military officers do, then, not only our kings, but our queens, as *pontifices maximi*[o], may themselves consecrate in person, because what they can authorize or commissionate others to do they may do themselves, as manage their own revenues, fight their own battles, and administer justice in their own courts. But this is such a sacrilegious assertion, as I am confident none but himself, and such as, like himself, are abandoned to all modesty as well as principles, will or dare assert. He was aware of this consequence in his Preface[p], as an objection, and therefore he slily endeavours to smuggle it, by insinuating that it is only for the same reason our princes cannot exercise the ecclesiastical function for which they cannot judge in person. "Our princes," saith he, "can no more judge in person, than exercise the ecclesiastical function." But this assertion is both against reason and fact; against reason, as he may learn from his master, Hobbes[q]; and against fact, as he may see in Mr. Selden's notes upon these words, *Proprio ore nullus regum Angliæ,* in the eighth chapter of Sir John Fortescue's book, *De Laudibus Legum Angliæ*[r]. The former shews

[o] ["Since they (our princes) are to see that all ecclesiastics in their several stations do their duty, they may be termed, as they have been of old by the clergy themselves, Pastores Pastorum, Episcopi Episcoporum, Pontifices Maximi," &c.—Ibid.]

[p] Ibid.

[q] Dialogue between a Philosopher and a Student of the Common Laws of England, pp. 65, 66; [A posthumous work, appended to Hobbes' Rhetoric and first published in 8vo. 1681. "*Lawyer.* Seeing the king (as Sir Edward Coke affirms, 4 Inst., p. 71,) hath committed all his power judicial, some to one court, and some to another, so as if any man would render himself to the judgment of the king, in such case where the king hath committed all his power judicial to others, such a render should be to no effect. And (p. 73) he saith farther: that in this court, the kings of this realm have sitten on the high bench, and the judges of that court on the lower bench, at his feet; but judicature belongeth only to the judges of that court, and in his presence they answer all motions.

"*Phil.* I cannot believe that Sir Edward Coke, how much soever he desired to advance the authority of himself and other justices of the common law, could mean that the king in the king's bench sat as a spectator only, and might not have answered all motions, which his judges answered, if he had seen cause for it. For he knew that the king was supreme judge there in all causes temporal, and is now in all causes both temporal and ecclesiastical, and that there is an exceeding great penalty ordained by the laws for them that shall deny it. But Sir Edward, as he had (you see) in many places before, hath put a fallacy upon himself by not distinguishing between committing and transferring. He that transferreth his power hath deprived himself of it: but he that committeth it to another to be exercised in his name and under him, is still in the possession of the same power."—Hobbes' Works, vol. vi. pp. 51, 52. London, 1840.]

[r] [De Laudibus Legum Angliæ, written by Sir John Fortescue, lord chief justice, and afterwards lord chancellor to King Henry VI.; hereto are

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXII.

how Sir Edward Coke "put a fallacy upon himself, by not distinguishing between committing and transferring power." And the latter proves, from rolls and charters, that our kings sat in court in the king's bench. He may find many such proofs elsewhere, as in *Hist. Croyland. continuat.*[s], p. 458. And in old charters nothing is more common than grants in such terms as these: *Coram nobis, vel capitali justitiario nostro, aut per præceptum nostrum; nisi in præsentia mea; nisi coram me, vel ubi nominatim præcepero; non in placitum intrent, nisi in præsentia nostra, vel hæredum nostrorum; coram nobismet ipsis, vel capitali justitia nostra.* He will find the same was customary in Normandy, if he pleases to consult *Neustria Pia,* pp. 253, 855[t], &c., and *Preuves de l'Histoire d'Harcourt,* p. 1281[u]. Also in Scotland, as in King Malcome's charter to Coldingham, *Nisi in presentia mea, vel in præsentia supremæ justitiæ;* Dalrymple's Collections, p. 401[v]. So in Spelman's Glossary, in the word *Bancus*[w], *In eo præsidebat olim capitalis Angliæ justitiarius, et interdum ipse rex. Hodie vero capitalis, quem vocant, justitiarius, tribus, vel quatuor assesso-*

joined the two summes of Sir Ralph de Hengham, and notes both on Fortescue and Hengham are added, (by Selden, as appears from his quoting his Titles of Honour as his own, notes on cap. xvii. n. 7. p. 21.) London, 1616. Fortescue said, cap. viii. p. 24, "proprio ore, nullus regum Angliæ judicium proferre usus est." Selden, in the notes on this, p. 4, says, "Yes, certainly, the kings themselves often sate in court, (in the king's bench,) and in the rolls of charters under King John and the time near him, often occur grants that such and such English should not be impleaded or put to answer 'nisi coram nobis vel capitali justitia nostra,' and to Normans, 'nisi coram nobis vel capitali senescallo nostro.'" He then gives instances.]

[s] [Historia Croylandiensis continuata, apud Rerum Anglicarum Script. Vett., tom. i. p. 458. Oxon. 1684. The abbot of Croyland, A.D. 1191, being oppressed by John during the absence of his brother, produced in the exchequer a charter of the king "in qua prohibet rex ne abbas de Croyland ponatur in placitum nisi coram seipso."]

[t] [Neustria Pia, seu de omnibus et singulis abbatiis et prioratibus totius Normaniæ, quibus extruendis, fundandis, dotandisque pietas Neustriaca magnificentissime eluxit et commendatur, deque sanctarum illarum domorum rectoribus, privilegiis, et aliis ad ipsas quoquomodo spectantibus, auctore R. Patre Artun du Monstrier Rothomagensi, ordinis Fratrum Minorum Recollectorum Presbytero. Rothomagi, 1663. p. 252, nisi coram me, vel coram mea capitali justitia; Charter of Henry III. to the abbey of Fécamp, p. 855, nisi coram nobis, vel coram capitali justitia nostra. Charter of Rich. I. to the abbey of Valassy (Valacia, or de voto.)]

[u] ["Et prohibemus ne ponantur in publicum de aliquo tenementorum suorum, nisi coram nobis vel coram capitali justitia nostra." In a grant of Richard I. to the abbey of St. Mary de voto (Valassy.) Preuves de l'Histoire genealogique de la Maison de Harcourt, tom. iv. Paris. 1662.]

[v] [Collections concerning the Scottish History preceding the death of King David the First in the year 1153, by Sir James Dalrymple, Bart. Edinburgh, 1705.]

[w] [Glossarium Archaiologicum, authore Henrico Spelmano, p. 59. col. 1. London, 1664.]

ribus. So in the word *Justitia*, p. 331, col. i. *Proceres, et barones regni, e jure dignitatis; alii plurimi e tenuræ ratione; complurimi etiam e regum privilegio, ut copiose indicant diplomata, in placitum non vocarentur de tenementis suis,* [*sicut nec barones aliis utique de causis,*] *nisi coram rege, vel capitali ejus justiciario. Placita autem civilia, vulgariter dicta communia, sub illis seculis una agebantur in palatio regis coram ipso rege, seu capitali ejus justitiario.* So in *Matt. Paris de vitis xxiii. Abbat. S. Albani*, p. 143[x]. *Unde mota ante regem querela, tandem sententiante ipso rege*, &c. So *Abbas de Furnō dedit* 200 *marcas, ut sit quietus de* 500 *marcis, unde amerciatus fuit per os regis, 7 Johannis*, m. i.[y] In the proceedings against Thomas a Becket, *Rege cum principibus* (*pontificibus substractis*) *sedente pro tribunali*, out of *Quadrilogus* [c. 38.] by Dr. Brady, in his Complete History of England, p. 392[z]. So in Mr. Madox's *Formulare Angl. Form.* 659[a]. *Facta fuit hæc conventio in præsentia et curia domini Henrici regis* (*secundi*). So in a grant of Hen. II., pleaded in *Michaelis*, 8vo. *Johannis, Rot.* 10. *dorso*, Berkshire[b]: *Henricus rex*, &c. *Sciatis me dedisse, et charta mea confirmasse Hugoni de Mara, pro homagio suo, et servitio in feodo et hæreditate, Dudecotam, cum omnibus pertinentiis, quam Robertus de Aubenio mihi clamavit, de se, et hæredibus suis in curia mea apud Westmonast. coram me, et coram baronibus, et justitiariis meis, tunc ibidem præsentibus, pro concordia magni forisfacti sui*, &c.

So *Mich. et Hil.* 13 *Johan. Rot.* 7. *Eborum*[c]. *Sciant præsentes et futuri, quod hæc concordia facta in curia domini regis*

[x] [p. 1072 of the edition published at London, 1683; appended to the Historia Major. ed. Wats. London, 1684. The king was Henry III.]

[y] [This is the eighteenth abbot of Furness, Robert Denton. The words are, "Abbas de Furneis dat ducentas marcas et ii palefridos, ut quietus sit de misericordia quingentarum marcarum, unde amerciatus fuit per os Regis pro Foresta," &c.—Rot. de Finibus, 7 Joh. membr. 1. See the amerciament in Madox, Hist. of the Exchequer, vol. ii. p. 528. 1769.]

[z] [A complete History of England, by Robert Brady, M. D. London. fol. London, 1685; the work quoted is the Vita S. Thom. Cant. &c., commonly called, from the four writers, Quadrilogus.]

[a] [Formulare Anglicanum, or a Collection of Ancient Charters and Formularies. London, 1702. Formulare 659, p. 368, here referred to, is a release from the house of Bradley to the canons of Brumore of the church of Rokeburne.]

[b] [Placitorum Abbreviatio, p. 54, b. Published by the Record Commissioners, 1811. Robertus de Aubeni petit versus Gaufridum de la Mare villam de Dudecot sicut jus ~~suum et cum~~ placitum esset inter eos, Gaufridus ~~tulit~~ cartam Regis Henrici patris in hac forma, Henricus Rex, &c.]

[c] [This and the two following records the Editor has not been able to collate.]

apud turrim London. a die S. Michaelis in xv. dies, anno regni Johannis 3. *coram ipso domino rege, Simone de Pateshul, Jacobo de Poterna, Henrico de Potandener, Rogero Huscarl, et aliis fidelibus domini regis tunc ibidem præsentibus, inter Gilbertum filium Rogeri, et Helewig uxorem suam, petentes, et Robertum Bainard tenentem, &c., et sciendum quod dom. rex Johannes, &c.* I refer our author to Merculf's *Formulæ Solennes,* lib. i. c. 25, and Bignonius' notes thereupon, p. 287[d]. And thence let him return home to these two domestic records.

Placita coram domino rege apud Warewyck in Octavis S. Michaelis, anno regni Henrici filii regis Johannis 50. *incipiente* 51. *Rot.* 13.

Gilbertus de Clare Com. Gloc. et Hertf. implacitavit Matildam, quæ fuit uxor Richardi de Clare, comitis Glocestr. et Hertf. quod plus habuit dotis in terra sua, quam habere deberet, quia habuit castrum de Husk, et alias terras Wallenses guerrinas, cum non debeat habere eas neque castrum, &c. Postea recitata fuit loquela ista coram domino rege et consilio suo, ipso domino rege sedente pro tribunali apud Westm.

Communia de Termino Sancti Hilar. 39 *Hen. III. penes Remem. Regis.*

Sedente domino rege in scaccario venit Willielmus de Pakeham, senescallus episcopi Norwic. et petiit quendam magnum piscem monstruosum, captum in terra cujusdam pueri, qui est in custodia ipsius episcopi, cujus antecessores semper consueverunt habere Wrekum, ut dicebat, sicut liquet, per inquisitionem quam dominus rex inde fieri fecit; et responsum fuit ei per dominum regem, quod ostenderet chartas, si quas haberet, per quas clamaret talem libertatem, alioquin per inquisitionem prædictam, in quam rex se non posuit, nil caperet, maxime cum nullus habeat Wrekum, nisi per dominum regem in terra sua: et tunc quæsitum fuit a prædicto Willielmo, utrum prædictus piscis captus fuit super terram vel in mari? Respondit quod in mari non longe a terra, et quod captus fuit vivus; ita quod

[d] [The work alluded to is, "Marculfi monachi aliorumque auctorum Formulæ Solennes, notis Bignonii illustrat." Paris. 1666. The title of lib. i. c. 25, is, 'Prologus de Regis judicio cum de magna re duo causantur simul.' The formula runs of the king hearing the cause; and Bignonius' note begins, 'Reges nostros olim proprio ore jus dixisse notum est, episcopis et proceribus assidentibus, præsertim de majoribus causis,' &c.; he then gives evidence and instances of it.]

circiter sex batelli submersi fuerunt, antequam posset capi. Et tunc respondit ei dominus, quod de sicut ipse cognovit, quod piscis captus fuit in mari et vivus, non potuit esse Wrekum, voluit alias super habere considerationem. Et datus est ei dies, &c.

After these examples of kings sitting and administering justice in their courts of judicature, I must ask him again, and all his readers deceived by him, if the king empowers the bishops to consecrate bishops, just as he empowers his judges to sit in his courts and administer justice? Have they no more power to consecrate, before he sends them the mandate for consecration, than the judges have to sit in his courts and administer justice, before their commission? Or doth their power to consecrate commence with the royal mandate, as that of the judges doth with their patents? Do they "act ministerially" under him, when they consecrate, in the same sense as the judges do, when they administer justice; that is, do they consecrate bishops in the king or queen's name and stead, and as the king or queen's representatives, as judges administer justice[e]? or may the king or queen preside over the bishops in consecration, whom he commands to consecrate, or act with them in the holy administration, as they formerly used to preside in their courts, and administer justice with their judges, nay, pronounce sentence with their own mouths? These questions plainly shew, that the acts of parliament with which he assaults the ecclesiastical power are only penal restraining acts, by which the bishops are required, under the pains of præmunire, to consecrate the person nominated and presented by the king or queen, and no other. The very words of the statute 25 Hen. VIII., c. 20, supposeth the bishops to have the same sacerdotal power to consecrate bishops as to ordain priests; and if an act were now made to lay the same, or other penal restraints upon them, as to ordination of priests, would it follow from thence, that in ordaining priests they acted

[e] Cujus personam in judicio, et judicando, representant.—Hen. Bracton, lib. iii. c. 10. f. 108. [Henrici de Bracton de legibus et consuetudinibus Angliæ libri v. London, 1569. The chapter begins, Dictum est in proximo de ordinaria jurisdictione quæ pertinet ad regem, consequenter dicendum est de jurisdictione delegata, ubi quis ex seipso nullam habet auctoritatem, sed ab alio sibi commissam, cumque ipso qui delegat non sufficiat per se omnes causas sive jurisdictiones terminare.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXII.

ministerially under the queen and in her stead, and derived their power of ordination, as other civil or military officers derive theirs, from her majesty's signet or broad seal?

After writing all this to set the question of the bishops' power to consecrate bishops in a true light, I need make no difficulty to say the same of it, and every other part of their sacerdotal power, what two very learned men, the bishop of Lincoln, and Dr. Kennett dean of Peterborough, say of their power to summon and hold convocations.

"The statute[f] of the 25 of Hen. VIII. had not any other influence on the state of these assemblies (the convocation) [as to this matter] than only this; that whereas before the archbishop might, whenever he pleased, without any other direction, by his own proper motion have summoned his clergy to his synod; now he may do it but by the king's writ to warrant him therein; but as for the power of calling them, that is still left to him, as [it was] before; his mandates run in the same form, and by his summons it is, and by no other, that our convocations do assemble at this day."

"Should we ever be so unhappy under a Christian magistrate[g], as to be denied all liberty of these assemblies, though the governors and fathers of the Church should with all their care and interest endeavour to obtain it; should he so far abuse his prerogative, as to turn it not only to the detriment, but to the ruin of all true religion and morality among us, and thereby make it absolutely necessary for something extraordinary to be done to preserve both: in such a case of extremity, I have before said, and I still adhere to it, [that] the bishops and pastors of the Church must resolve to hazard all in the discharge of their duty; they must meet, consult, and resolve upon such measure, as, by God's assistance, they shall think their unhappy circumstances to require, and be content to suffer any loss, and to run any danger for so doing."

[f] [The passage continues; "For then the prince would only have the name of a Christian, but would act like an infidel; and so having thrown off the care and protection of the Church, it would naturally return to the bishops and pastors to whom Christ committed it, to take upon themselves the care and protection of it."] The State of the Church and Clergy of England, [in their councils, synods, convocations, conventions, and other public assemblies,] by William Wake, D.D., dean of Exeter, [bishop of Lincoln, in 1705.] London, 1703, ch. i. sect. 20. p. 11. [This work was a reply to Atterbury's Rights, &c., quoted pp. 223, sqq.]

[g] Ibid., ch. iii. § 12. p. 86.

To this purpose Mr. Dean Kennett, in the Preface to his Ecclesiastical Synods[h], declares, that one motive of writing it was this[i]: "To assert the nature of the Christian Church, as a society endowed with fundamental rights to preserve its own being; and among these a right for the governors to assemble and agree upon the common measures of faith and unity, as at first independent on the heathen, so even now on the Christian magistrate, when the necessities of desertion and persecution so require."

So in p. 98 of the book: "Indeed if an English synod find it necessary to support religion by some new constitutions, and upon the prospect of such necessity desire the prince's leave to provide for it; and the prince long and often denies that leave, with design of letting the Church, being incapable to consult her own preservation: in such a case (which is not ours) let the Church be true to Christ, and to the powers she received from Him. This is the original right which we assert." So in p. 82, saith he, "Therefore for all this act of submission, (Dr. Wake) would not have our princes think, that the convocations of the clergy should depend on their mere arbitrary will, but on the benefit of the Church, and the great occasion of religion. For he says, p. 145[j], 'Notwithstanding any thing that has hitherto been said, I shall not doubt to affirm, that whenever the king is in his own conscience convinced, that for the convocation to sit and act [would] be for the glory of God, the benefit of the Church, or otherwise for the public good and welfare of his realm; he is obliged both by the law of reason as a man, by his duty to God as a Christian, and by his duty to his people, as a ruler set over them for their good, to permit, or rather to command his clergy to meet in convocation, and transact what is fit, for any or all these ends, to be done by them.'" So in p. 83 he cites the bishop for saying, when the king doth abuse his trust[k], '"When the exigences of the Church call for a convocation . . . . I confess the Church has a right to its sitting;

[h] [Ecclesiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations in the Church of England, historically stated and justly vindicated from the misrepresentations of Mr. Atterbury, by White Kennett, D.D. 1701. He became dean of Peterborough in 1707.]

[i] Preface, p. ix.

[j] [The authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods asserted, by William Wake, D.D. London, 1697.]

[k] [Wake, ibid., pp. 267, 268, quoted by Kennett, p. 83.]

and if circumstances be such as to require their frequent sitting, during those circumstances it has a right to their frequent meeting and sitting; and if the prince be sensible of this, and yet will not suffer the clergy to come together; in that case I do acknowledge, that he would abuse the trust that is lodged in him, and deny the Church a benefit which of right it ought to enjoy.'" So in p. 84 he cites him for saying[l], that "'whenever the civil magistrate shall so far abuse his authority, as to render it necessary for the clergy, by some extraordinary methods, to provide for the Church's welfare, that necessity will warrant their taking of them.'" So in p. 85 he recites from Dr. Atterbury this passage out of the bishop of Sarum's History of the Reformation[m], "'That the extreme of raising the ecclesiastical power too high in the times of popery, had now produced another of depressing it too much; so seldom is the counterpoise so justly balanced, that extremes are reduced to a well-tempered mediocrity.'"

Our author hath other trifling sophistical arguments against Church governments being placed by God in the Apostles and their successors, which, as the archbishop of Spalato observes[n], are all arguments against fact; and any man will easily discern the weak and fallacious nature of them, who understands the true nature of Church government, or the

[l] [Wake, ibid., p. 43, quoted by Kennett, p. 84.]

[m] [Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. ii. pp. 49, 50. fol. 1681, quoted by Atterbury in his Rights, Powers, &c. of an English Convocation, p. 112, ed. 1. p. 142, ed. 2, and by Kennett, p. 85.]

[n] Sed post Christi ascensum in cœlum, quod genus regiminis per homines mortales exercendi idem Christus in Ecclesia reliquerit et instituerit, erit nobis in hoc primo libro inquirendum. Quæsitum proculdubio facti duntaxat est, ut loquuntur jurisperiti: [nam potuit Rex Christus, non destructo suo regno monarchico, eam formam regiminis spiritualis instituere, quæ ipsi magis placuerit:] quænam vero forma regiminis ei magis placuerit, hariolandum non est, sed ex ipso facto inquirendum; [et quamvis neminî dubium sit, neque esse possit, quin et potuerit et voluerit salvator noster Jesus Christus, Ecclesiam suam (ut ponit illustrissimus Bellarminus) ea ratione et modo gubernare, quæ sit omnium optimus et utilissimus]. Is tamen (modus regiminis) sitne monarchicus, an aristocraticus, an democraticus, an ex his mistus, non tam ex nostra speculatione, et dialecticis humanæ sapientiæ rationibus pendet, quam ex ipso facto Christi.... Optime sane monuit Onuphrius Panvinius [in libro de Comitiis Imperatoriis, et cum eo Bellarminus]; non esse fidelis historici rem describere, ut fieri debuisset; sed ut facta est. Alioqui enim, inquit, non res gestæ scribuntur, sed mendacia obtruduntur. Quod autem factum sit, non ex philosophiæ promptuariis hauriendum est, sed eorum narratione ac fide [qui interfuerunt, vel qui ab iis qui interfuerunt acceperunt; aut certe qui aliorum testimonio sibi commendata literis et memoriæ tradiderunt]. Ita nos ex Evangelistis, et Apostolis, ac sanctis patribus quæsiti nostri solutionem, non ex nostro ingenio [vanaque probabilium dialectica] petere debemus.—De Republica Ecclesiastica Procem., lib. i. § 3, 4. p. 34. London, 1617.

true constitution of the Catholic Church, which was committed in part, and in whole, severally and jointly, to the Apostles and their successors, as I have partly shewed in the following letters; and the true idea of it may be learned by those who are not yet masters of it, from Spalatensis' book cited in the margin, or from the works of St. Cyprian, which those who understand not Latin may read in the French translation[o], or from an excellent little book, entitled, The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, printed for Walter Kettilby in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1695, and in the Vindication of it, and of the Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction, printed for Robert Clavel and George Strahan, 1701, to which I refer the reader[p].

As for his objection of a popedom being unavoidable from the episcopal constitution of Church government, and the necessity of having an external head and principle of union and communion in every Church[q], it needs no answer, the argument being contrary to the aristocratical constitution of the Catholic Church, as well as to matter of fact, and stands confuted by the consentient testimony and practice, not only of the Churches of Great Britain, but of the Greek and Oriental Churches, and all the members of them, as any man may soon see, who will read Nilus Thessalonicensis[r], Barlaam the Greek monk[s], and Nectarius patriarch of

[o] [The work referred to is, Les Œuvres de S. Cyprien, en Français, avec des notes, par M. Lombert. 4to. 1672. The notes are considered valuable. The first English translation of St. Cyprian's entire Works was made by Dr. Nathanael Marshall, and published in 1717.]

[p] [The two last-named works, the second being entitled the Vindication of the Cyprianic Age, &c., were written by Bishop John Sage, the author of the Reasonableness of a Toleration, &c. See note o, p. 290, and the life there referred to, p. lvii. note 1. The former is among the publications of the Spottiswoode Society for 1846.]

[q] ["Without some visible head or universal bishop the Church could never be so united in itself; ... without a common head ... it is impossible there should be a succession of bishops; ... without such a head no acts of a bishop could be valid further than his own district; ... nor without such a head could any differences between Churches independent of each other be composed."—Rights, c. x. § 29. pp. 404, 405.]

[r] [Nilus Cabasilas, archbishop of Thessalonica, Latinorum hostis infensissimus, (see R. G. apud Cave, Hist. Lit., tom. ii. App., p. 39,) cl. A.D. 1340. His principal works are, one, De Processione Spiritus Sancti; and that here referred to, De Primatu Papæ; printed in Greek at London, without year or printer's name; in Greek and Latin, besides other places, at Hanover, with notes, by Salmasius, 1608.]

[s] [Barlaam the monk was cotemporary with Nilus Cabasilas; he was born in Calabria, and brought up in the Latin Church. He afterwards went over to the Greeks, and wrote against the Latins, and became abbot of St. Saviour's at Constantinople. He took an active part in the disputes between the Churches; but matters not taking the course he wished, he withdrew from

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXII.

Jerusalem[t], and many others, against the papal supremacy[u], and the several accounts, particularly that excellent one which Dr. Tho. Smith wrote, of the state of the Greek Church[v].

To mention his calumny upon the English clergy for "carrying the power of the Church as high as the papists themselves," and assuming a power to judge for the people[x],

Constantinople, was condemned and excommunicated. On this he rejoined the Latin Church, and was made bishop of Hieracum, a small island near Sardinia. The work referred to is, Liber contra Primatum Papæ; it was first published at Oxford in 1595; and afterwards with Nilus' work by Salmasius in 1608; and with that also appended to his treatise de Primatu Papæ. Lugd. Bat. 1645. (Cave, Hist. Lit., tom. ii. App., pp. 36, 37.)]

[t] [Nectarius was Patriarch of Jerusalem from 1662 to 1671. See an interesting history of his life in Renaudot's edition of Gennadius' Homiliæ de Sacramento Eucharistiæ; Paris, 1709. His work is frequently referred to in Hickes' Letters, &c., mentioned in the next note. It is called, Confutatio Imperii Papæ in Ecclesiam, and was written (see Hickes' Letters, p. 88.) "in answer to Dom. Petre." A Latin translation was published by Dr. Allin in 1702.]

[u] See the Reverend Mr. Chishul's Letter at the end of the preface to a book entituled, Several Letters between Dr. Hickes and a Popish Priest, 1705. [The letter is one of a few lines only, addressed to Hickes by the Rev. Edmund Chishull, then Fellow of C.C.C., Oxford, who appears to have had a collection of tracts written by members of the Greek Church. He had been chaplain at Smyrna; and was distinguished for his antiquarian knowledge and works. His "Travels in Turkey and back to England" were published, after his death, by Dr. Mead in 1747.—See Chalmers' Biog. Brit. His letter enclosed a paper of testimonies of the Greeks against the Latins, which occupies one page. They are; 1. An extract from the confession of the faith of the Greek Church, compiled by a synod at Jass in Moldavia, and confirmed by another at Constantinople in the presence of the four patriarchs, A.D. 1643; which enumerates the Roman among particular and local Churches, *διατὶ αἱ τοπικαὶ ἐκκλησίαι εἶναι μερικαί· οἷον ἡ Ἐφεσίνη, ἡ ἐν Φιλαδελφείᾳ, ἡ ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ, ἡ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, ἡ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, ἡ ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἡ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, καὶ αἱ λοιπαί.* The confession, called "Orthodoxa Confessio Catholicæ atque Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ Orientalis," is printed in Kimmel's Libri Symbolici Ecclesiæ Orientalis, Jenæ. 1843. The passage quoted is Pars i. Quæst. 84. p. 154. An epistle by Nectarius is prefixed, p. 45. See the Prolegomena, pp. liv. sqq. 2. The testimony of the then patriarch of Jerusalem in the preface to his edition of the *τόμος ἀγάπης*: where he says, that if the Latins would admit that the bishop of Rome is chief and head in the Church only in the same sense in which the orientals maintain the patriarch of Constantinople to be so, the Greeks would admit the same: but as the Latins would not concede this, it concludes, *ἄρα καὶ ἡμεῖς οὐ παραδεχόμεθα τὸν Ῥώμης οὔτε πρῶτον, οὔτε κεφαλήν, οὔτε μὲν διόλου ἐπίσκοπον ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.* 3. Another volume, by the same patriarch, under the title of *τόμος καταλλαγῆς*, of which the following are summaries of particular chapters; *ὅτι οὐ μόνον ὁ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης θρόνος ἀποστολικὸς καλεῖται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕκαστος τῶν ἄλλων πατριαρχικῶν θρόνων.* And, *ὅτι μία καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία, οὐχ ἡ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης λέγεται, ἀλλ' ἡ τῆς οἰκουμένης πάσης τῶν ὀρθοδόξων.*]

[v] [An Account of the Greek Church, as to its Doctrine and Rites of Worship, &c., by Thomas Smith, D.D., and Fellow of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxon. London, 1680. See pp. 2—7, 71, sqq. Smith had resided some time at Constantinople. His work was first published in Latin by Bishop Fell, at the Theatre, Oxford, in 1676, under the title, De Græcæ Ecclesiæ hodierno Statu Epistola; and afterwards, with large additions, in English, in 1680.]

[x] ["That which gave the papists so great advantage, was clergymen's talking . . so very inconsistent with themselves . . . when they disputed with papists and dissenters. . . When they

is sufficient for its confutation. And as he misapplied some passages before out of my Lord Clarendon's Answer to Cressy[y], and Dr. Barrow's book Against the Pope's Supremacy, to the independency of the Church, as a society, upon the state; so with equal malice and assurance he perverts the words of Mr. Chillingworth against the infallibility and tyranny of the pope, by misapplication to the Church of England[z], though he esteems that great man's authority in behalf of the Church of England and her episcopal government[a] no more than straw, or rotten wood. He cites King Charles II. for saying in a comparison of the Church of England and the Church of Rome, "that one seemed to be in earnest, and the other in jest[b]." I have recited this saying of that

had to do with papists . . they affirmed that no man was obliged to submit to the doctrine or discipline of any or all the Churches in the world, if he judged it not agreeable to the word of God. But when they argued with the dissenters and at all other times, they talked diametrically opposite to this, and carried the power and authority of the Church as high as the papists themselves . . . They were for forcing men by ecclesiastical and civil penalties to comply, though ever so much against their consciences. And what did the papists, or what can they do more for the sake of a blind obedience and an implicit belief."—Rights, ibid., § 30. p. 406.]

[y] [See above, p. 248.]

[z] ["The difference between Mr. Chillingworth and those who writ sometimes before him, is that they had carried their notion of Church authority so high as to make the separation from Rome unjustifiable; but though he effectually justifies it, yet it is by destroying all Church authority. What can be more opposite to it than his saying, (Part i. chap. 4. n. 16,) that 'this presumptuous imposing of the senses of men upon the words of God, the special senses of men upon the general words of God, and laying them upon men's consciences together under equal pain of death and damnation &c. Take away this persecuting, burning, cursing, damning of men for not subscribing to the words of men as the words of God; require of Christians only to believe Christ, and to call no man master but Him only; let those leave claiming infallibility who have no title to it; and let them that in their words disclaim it, disclaim it likewise in their actions; in a word take away tyranny,'" &c. Rights, chap. x. § 32. pp. 407, 408. Chillingworth's words obviously are intended to refer to the Church of England, or its clergy, considered as exercising authority in matters of faith, without claiming infallibility. The words of Chillingworth immediately introducing the quotation being, "You are offended with him (Dr. Potter) for not usurping the authority which he hath not; in a word for not playing the pope. Certainly, if Protestants be faulty in this matter, it is for doing it too much, and not too little. This presumptuous imposing," &c.]

[a] [See his tract entitled, The Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy Vindicated; of which the last words are, "Episcopal government is acknowledged to have been universally received in the Church presently after the Apostles' times. Between the Apostles' times and this presently after, there was not time enough for, nor possibility of, so great an alteration. And therefore there was no such alteration as is pretended. And therefore episcopacy, being confessed to be so ancient and catholic, must be granted also to be apostolic: quod erat demonstrandum."—Chillingworth's Works, vol. ii. pp. 485—491. Oxford, 1838.]

[b] ["This conduct of theirs...their exclaiming against the Church of Rome for doing (though consistent with her own principles) the very same things they practised themselves, in exercising authority in matters of faith,

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXII.

prince, who saw abroad the strictness of Church discipline, to give the friends of our Church occasion to consider how much she is reproached for want of discipline, and put those in remembrance of their duty, who are concerned to restore the primitive godly discipline, to the primitive doctrine and government, of the Church. After the saying of King Charles II. he cites a saying of one he calls a reverend divine, which I think fit to recite, to let the world see that the Church of England, like her Saviour, hath Judas's among her priests, wolves in sheep's clothing, Arians, Socinians, and other sorts of large souls among her clergy, who are not only free thinkers, but free speakers, as the following words shew[c]: "The English priestcraft," said that reverend divine, "is the coarsest that I ever saw: the Romish is fine, and hath made a delicate book of Father Paul's Trent History; theirs is the depths of Satan, and ours is his shallows." This reverend divine, I doubt not, but was such a one as the author of the Principles of the Protestant Religion explained, in a Letter to a Lady[d]; a divine utterly unworthy of that name, and to minister in holy places and things, but altogether worthy of our author's acquaintance, and to be adorned by him, for both write the same blasphemies, and both alike endeavour the destruction of the Christian priesthood and Church. In the conclusion of his book he promises the world another[e], in which he saith, "if he may be allowed to be a competent judge, the reader will find a full answer to all the arguments drawn from Scriptures, as well as reason, for the independent power of the clergy." Here he hangs out his flag of defiance to the clergy, and let them look to themselves. He is, in his own opinion, and I suppose that of his club, their invincible champion against priesthood. However, let me say again of this unanswerable 'full answer,' *che venga*, let it come, and fear it not; for as God hath hitherto raised up Davids from among His despised servants of the clergy, to encounter and conquer these 'men of Gath;' so I hope a spirit of fortitude will still come from

gave occasion to that saying of their beloved King Charles II.," &c.—Rights, chap. x. § 36. p. 411.]

[c] [Rights, ibid.]

[d] [See above, p. 212.]

[e] ["Since this discourse grows too bulky for one volume, I shall finish the rest in the next, where," &c.—Rights, chap. x. § 38. p. 413. See above, note f, p. 184.]

RIGHTS OF THE CHURCH.

Him upon others of them, to go out and fight with them, though they defy us, and as it were threaten "to give our flesh unto the fowls of the air, and to the beasts of the field." Will you hear the words of their challenge from him? "Nor[f] can those," saith he, speaking of himself, "who differ from him, have any just reason to be dissatisfied for his giving them an opportunity to expose and baffle all the contrary arguments, since if they have truth on their side, nothing can do their cause a greater kindness, than mustering up those reasons which oppose it." Is not this bravado of our author something like that of the Philistine, who cried out unto the armies of Israel, and said, "choose you a man for you, and let him come and fight with me; I defy the armies of Israel, give me a man that we may fight together?" He boasts[g] what obligations the world hath to him "for defending the natural rights of mankind" (which we shall see how he will maintain against the Rehearsal) "as a man, and as a Christian, for striking at the root of antichristian priestcraft."

Thus, if they were alive, might Hobbes, and Blunt, and many other sons of Belial brag; and thus may all the authors cited in the Axe laid to the root of Christianity, boast of their merits for freeing men and Christians from the yoke. He saith[h], "he hopes the laity will take him into their protection, for his love to truth, and zeal for the Church by law established:" yes, for the love and zeal he hath shewed to truth and her, in writing against her episcopal government, in depraving and profaning her holy offices, in exposing her priests, and abusing the Christian priesthood, and deriving all her spiritual or ecclesiastical power from the magistrate, and in asserting her to tyrannize over the consciences of men as much, though not with so good a grace, as the Church of Rome.

If this be love for truth, and zeal, and merit for the Church of England, indeed he deserves not only protection from the laity, but praise and honour from the clergy, even as much praise and honour as another gentleman of the laity truly deserves from them, who is the reverse to him in his writings

[f] Ibid., p. 414.

[g] Ibid. ["The author hopes that no person, considered either as a man, can blame him for defending the natural rights of mankind," &c.]

[h] Ibid., p. 415.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXII.

about the Church and priesthood[i], even as much reverse to him and his writings, I had almost said, as good itself is to evil, or a good to an evil angel. But then it follows[k], if I "be so unhappy as to fall under the displeasure of some ecclesiastics, even of the national Church, for striking at their great Diana," meaning the distinction of the Church from the state. What fall under the displeasure of the "national Church" for his zeal for the "Church established by law?" Are these two different Churches? Can he deserve well of the one, and fall under the displeasure of the other? This is paradox and riddle, which I leave him to explain, and to tell me which clergy it is, the clergy of the "national Church," or of "the Church established by law," which in the next words he tells the laity are "their mortal enemies, who claim an absolute uncontrolable power over their minds, and by consequence over their persons and estates[l]."

I have now done with the Rights, and the author of it, but must tell my reader, that I have not said all that I might upon his book. For I might have noted more of his contradictions, of which take an example or two; p. 5 he saith, "if the father by the law of nature had absolute power over the son, he could not be deprived of it[m]," and yet p. 10 he saith, "that the power which every man hath by the law of nature may be transferred by him to the magistrate." In pp. 14, 15, "all men in judging for themselves in religious matters, and all religious assemblies, even clubs and meetings for pleasure, must be independent of the magistrate," but the independency of the priesthood through his whole book is an intolerable grievance. In some places he writes as if persecution were wholly owing to the claim of an independent power, and yet he asserts that the Apostles and first bishops (who were most persecuted) claimed no such power; p. 190 he saith, "the laity can have no motive or temptation to abuse and corrupt religion," and yet the reader will find he impeaches the clergy for servilely complying with princes, who have for their

[i] A Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England, with Collects and Prayers for each Solemnity. 4th edit. By Robert Nelson.

[k] [This clause precedes the one last quoted from the Rights.]

[l] [Rights, ibid.]

[m] ["And consequently," the passage continues, "all government but the paternal would be unlawful."]

interest "corrupted religion;" p. 263 he saith, "no heathens were ever so stupid as to entertain such a monstrous contradiction as independent powers," and yet, p. 43, 98, "excommunication among Christians, the chief branch of the independent power, was derived from heathens, who governed all things by virtue of it, and kings were only their ministers to execute their sentences;" p. 265, "Constantine was entirely governed by the bishops," but p. 197, 201, "he governs and manages them." Also p. 118 he saith, "there were no feuds and animosities among the heathens upon the account of religion;" and p. 260, that "the heathens never persecuted one another upon that account," both which assertions are notoriously false, as can be made appear from the Greek and Latin historians. I have but noted few of the most odious names and characters he hath given the clergy, because it was tedious to collect them: as[n] "spiritual makebates, bareters, boutefeus, and incendiaries, who make churches serve to worse purposes than bear-gardens." I have passed over all his tragical and fallacious representations of the independent power, as the occasion of all mischiefs to human societies, as of "wars, massacres, murders, persecutions[o]" &c., in which way of arguing he may impeach not only the Scriptures and the whole Christian religion, as well as that part of it, but our Lord Himself; who foreseeing what divisions His doctrine would occasion in the world through the unbelief and wickedness of men, said, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth, I came not to send peace but a sword, to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother;" and so, had His infinite wisdom thought fit, He might have added, 'the wife against her husband, the servant against his master, and the subject against his prince.' Nay, in this way of arguing he might arraign the wisdom and goodness of God, for not making man infallible, impeccable, and immutably good, which really is the occasion of all the mischiefs to human societies, and the misery of mankind. There is nothing so good, but through the corruption and abuse of men, may be the occasion or accidental cause of evil. No one doctrine, I believe, in the

RIGHTS OF THE CHURCH.

Matt. 10. 34.

[n] Rights, p. 118.

[o] [Ibid., chap. viii. § 25. p. 261.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXII.

whole system of Christianity, which hath not occasioned feuds and differences in the world from the same accidental cause, as well as that of the independent power, and more particularly, not only from the unbelief of pagan, but from the ambition and mere worldly politics of sovereign Christian princes and states, or their being misled into heresies or schisms, which I could shew by numerous instances against our author from the histories of the Church.

I might also have shewed him the falseness of his assertion, that our princes can no more judge in person, than exercise the ecclesiastical function, from Bracton, lib. ii. cap. ix. x. fol. 107, 108[p], which I desire him, as well as the reader, to consult. I have shewed in my Dissertation of the use of the ancient Septentrional Literature[q], that our Saxon kings have judged in person, and he may find a *placitum* in the time of the Conqueror *Willielmo Rege tenente curiam*, in cart. Antiq. E. B. in the Tower, n. 1. In the Cotton Library, Julius D. 6, he may find another mentioned in the time of Edward the Confessor. *Sedente eo pro tribunali Die Festo in Aula Regia.* Thus the king upon appeals made into chancery from the court military often recites, that because he could not be personally present, he therefore constitutes delegates, Pat. 51 Edw. III. m. 17 dors.[r] and 36 dors.[s] There are also instances of the king's determining causes in person, as Pat. 13 Ric. II. m. 8. in the case of Scroop and Grosvenor, printed by Prynne on the fourth Institutes[t], p. 62. As also in that of Grey and Hastings[u], Pat. 1 Hen. V. pl. 1. m. 30.

[p] [c. ix. Cum autem de regimine sacerdotii nihil pertineat ad tractatum istum, ideo videndum erit de iis quæ pertineant ad regnum, quis primo et principaliter possit et debeat judicare. Et sciendum est quod ipse rex et non alius, si solus ad hoc sufficere possit, cum ad hoc per virtutem sacramenti teneatur astrictus, &c., and c. x. as quoted note e, p. 305.]

[q] [Dissertatio Epistolaris de Antiquæ Literaturæ Septentrionalis Utilitate, § ix. p. 40. Oxon. 1703, in the first volume of the Thesaurus Ling. Septent. Oxon. 1705.]

[r] [De appellatione determinanda. Calendarium Rotulorum Patentium. p. 195.]

[s] [Commissio de appellatione pro Roberto Knott. Ibid.]

[t] [Brief Animadversions on, Amendments explanatory of, additional Records to the fourth part of the Institutes, &c. (Coke's), by William Prynne, Esq., keeper of his majesty's records in the Tower of London, 1669. At p. 62, on p. 125, l. 43, he says "It is to be observed that after sentence pronounced in the court of chivalry in case of arms, the party grieved may appeal to the king, who by himself or his commissioners may give final judgment therein; whereof you may find a notable case Rot. Pat. 13 R. 2. I shall present the readers with the transcript of the record, to gratify heralds and those who delight in heraldry."]

[u] [Calend. Rot. Pat., p. 260.]

And I perceive by the specimen of Mr. Madoxe's History and Antiquities of the Exchequer[x], there will be many more instances of our kings administering justice in person to their subjects. In answer to his question, Preface, p. xi., "how could the parliament, if the convocation had a Divine right to make ecclesiastical laws, enable both Henry VIII. and Edward VI. to authorize thirty-two persons, half of them laymen, to establish all such ecclesiastical laws, as should be thought by the king and them convenient[y]," &c.? In answer, I say, to this question, and all he saith upon it, I thought to have shewed out of Dr. Atterbury's second edition of the Rights and Powers of an English Convocation[z], that from

[x] [The work itself was published by subscription by Thomas Madoxe, Esq., London, 1711. See chap. i. § 3. vol. i. pp. 6, 7; chap. iv. § 8. ibid. p. 191; and chap. xx. § 6. vol. ii. p. 10. In each of the last two passages, speaking respectively of the periods prior to the reigns of Henry III. and Edward III., he says, "The king if he pleased sat and acted in his exchequer." The references are to the second edition, of 1769.]

[y] [See note z, pp. 222, 223.]

[z] [As respects this particular act of parliament, Atterbury's answer is direct and conclusive; "the petition of the clergy in convocation, wherein this review of the canons is by them desired, preceded this act. What was done in this matter was done at their instance, and therefore had their authority."—Rights, Powers, &c., p. 188. (See above, p. 223, note a.) The portion of his work referred to by Hickes, is that in which he examines individually the instances alleged by Wake, "of several things relating to the Church, which have been done since the 25 Hen. VIII. by private commissions, or otherwise, out of convocation," in order to "shew upon each of them how far the ecclesiastical power concurred, and led the way to it;" and to vindicate the Reformation, "the process of which," he says, "I am satisfied was very regular, and canonical in most cases; though in some, by reason of the loss of records it cannot easily be proved so. Of this we are in general assured by such as lived at the time when those records were in being, particularly by Sir Robert Cotton and Mr. Fuller. The first in his Posthuma, (p. 215,) has these words, 'If any shall object, that many laws, in Henry the Eighth's time, had first the ground in parliament, it is manifested by the dates of their acts in convocation, that they all had in that place their first original.' The latter speaks as follows, (Church Hist., xvi. cent. p. (188.) 1655.) 'Upon serious examination it will appear, that there was nothing done in the reformation of religion, save what was acted by the clergy in their convocations, or grounded on some act of theirs precedent to it, with the advice, counsel, and consent of the bishops and most eminent churchmen; confirmed upon the post fact, and not otherwise, by the civil sanction; according to the usage of the best and purest times of Christianity.'" (Rights, Powers, &c., pp. 179, 180.) Fuller is answering the objection quoted below about "a parliament religion," &c., and, after the passage extracted by Atterbury, goes on to say, "By the same proportion in the days of Queen Mary the popish religion might have been styled a parliament religion, because after the same had been debated on, and concluded of in the convocation, it was confirmed by the queen, lords and commons, by the act of parliament." Atterbury proceeds to quote Bishop Burnet for the same view, "I shall add the testimony of one who must be allowed a good witness in this case, my lord of Sarum. He assures the bishop of Meaux, in the answer he made to his 'Variations,' (p. 35,) 'that our parliaments and princes have not meddled in matters of religion any other way, but that they have given the civil sanction to the propositions made

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXII.

many other instances of the like nature it is highly probable, that those acts had their first rise and original in the convocation. I cannot transcribe those excellent remarks, of which I believe the author of the Rights is not ignorant, but am forced to refer the reader to the book itself, from p. 179 to p. 206, being cut short very much against my will. In particular I desire my reader to consult the whole passage in Dr. Fuller's Church History[a], whereof the Doctor cites part, p. 180, and then he may guess why the author of the Rights, who is now known[b], would take no notice of that book, which would have led his reader to so good an answer not only to himself, but the most malicious objection of the papists against the Church of England, which he has made so much use of in other terms, viz., 'that we have a parliament religion, a parliament faith, a parliament gospel, parliament bishops, and a parliament Church[c].' It was good policy in a man, who turned, or was turning papist in the last of those two[d], which he now calls the persecuting reigns, to conceal from whom he borrowed that way of arguing from acts of parliament against the Church of England, and the independent power to which she hath an indefeasible title and right, as a member of the Catholic Church. I also thought to have shewed how[e] his notion of natural freedom, and founding all government in consent of parties, contrary to the laws and practice of all nations, the laws of the theocracy itself not excepted[f], and the Scriptures of the New Testament[g], makes slavery, villanage, and all purely despotical

by the Church: and this is what Christian princes do in all places.'" In proceeding to examine the particular instances, he observes of the bishop's History of the Reformation, that it was defective, partly from the want of records, partly from Burnet's not having noticed all that did exist; "so that it is no proof that nothing was done by the clergy because his lordship says nothing of it."—Rights, Powers, &c., p. 181.]

[a] Book v. cent. xvi. p. (188.)

[b] [In the first and second editions the words were, "the supposed author of the Rights, who is generally believed to be the true author." See note d, p. 50.]

[c] [See Fuller as above quoted, p. (188.) "Here I wonder at the cavil of the papists, which being so causeless, should be so clamorous, accusing us to have 'a parliament religion, a parliament faith, a parliament gospel,' (Harding's Confutation of Jewel's Apology, part 6, c. 2, p. 278. Antw. 1565); and another (Schultingius, Hierarchica Anacrisis, contra politiam Calvinianam, lib. vii. p. 85. Col. Agrip., 1604) addeth, 'parliament bishops and a parliament clergy.'"]

[d] [See note a, p. 48, and note r, p. 227.]

[e] Rights, Introduction, [§ 3, sqq. See above, pp. 182, 203, sqq.]

[f] Exod. xxi. 5—7; Levit. xxv. 44—46.

[g] 1 Tim. vi. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 18—21; Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 21; Tit. ii. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 21; Phil. xv. 16.

governments, where the people are the prince's property, inhuman, unnatural, and unlawful; but I am confined, and must not transgress my bounds. RIGHTS OF THE CHURCH.

I must also tell my reader, that variety of matter, and pursuit of thoughts, have made me forget some things. I forgot to name the answers written to the bishop of Sarum's Exposition on the twenty-third Article, to which I presumed to say, "I thought his lordship indebted for a just and full reply[h];" the first is intituled, "A Vindication of the twenty-third Article of the Church from a late Exposition[i]," &c. The other is in p. 202 of a book intituled, "The Reasonableness of a Toleration [of those of the episcopal persuasion] enquired into[k] [purely upon Church principles]." And I am glad of this opportunity to recommend so excellent a book unto the world.

Thus much I thought myself obliged to write in answer to the book of the Rights[l]; without premising a confutation of which, the two following dissertations, which were in the press when that book was first published[m], could not, I thought, with any good grace or assurance, make their entrance into the world. I am satisfied there is nothing in that book of any seeming force, or contrary to the doctrines I have delivered in them, but what I have fairly and fully answered, without fallacies and sophisms, with which that book almost in every page abounds. But I have manifestly solved them all, at least the chiefest of them, and also shewed that the whole of it is nothing but *bis cocta crambe*, or a mere rhapsody of cavils and calumnies, picked and collected out of the vilest writers, not only against the Church of England, but against the Catholic Church, at which this enemy of Christianity, and of the Christian priesthood, strikes through her sides. I say against the Church of England, whose very misfortunes, which she could not prevent, this SECT. XXIII. Concluding remarks.

[h] [See above, p. 286.]

[i] London, printed for Thomas Bennet at the Half Moon in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1702. [See above, note f, p. 286.]

[k] London, printed in the year 1705. pp. 202—208. [It was written by Bp. Sage. See a part of the argument, note o, p. 290.]

[l] [The whole of the remaining part of this Discourse (except the answer of Laud, p. 321; the address to the clergy, pp. 325, 326; and the last paragraph) was added in the third edition.]

[m] [This statement seems to contradict what is said above, p. 67, that he was "provoked to publish" the two Discourses by "a late book entitled the Rights," &c. The earlier statement, as made at the time, is more likely to be correct; four years had elapsed before these additions were written.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXIII.

penman of the deists imputes to her as crimes; against the Church of England, whose ruin this Satanical sect of men seek above all other Churches, because she is so like the primitive Church; and therefore in this miscellaneous book of the Rights, they have drawn up in battle-array against her, not only the arguments of popish writers[n], but of the Epicureans out of Spinoza the apostate Jew's works[o], to disaffect men against all priests and all revealed religion; against the Old as well as the New Testament, and bring them to an utter contempt and disbelief of Moses and Jesus Christ. There is nothing relating to the Church and her constitution which their malice hath left unattacked: her truly Catholic doctrine; her Divine authority; her apostolical mission; her spiritual discipline, or power of censures; her priesthood; her holy Sacraments; her revenues, or rather the poor remainder of them; her primitive polity, and government by bishops; her independency on the powers of the world, or whatsoever else belongs to her as a society or a sect. All this have they done in this one masterpiece of their anti-christian heresy, which, before it was put to the press, passed through many of their hands to patch it up as neatly as they could together, and give it all the advantages that wit and malice could give it, to make it acceptable to a wicked world. In particular, it was perused by Mr. Locke before he died, as the great disperser and preconizer of it at home and abroad confessed to one of my friends[p]. But, God be thanked, the antidotes have prevailed against the poison of it among all who have had the ingenuity impartially to read the answers to it: and as

[n] [See above, pp. 223, 228.]

[o] [See note h, p. 69.]

[p] [For the alleged connection of the Rights with Locke, see, A Dissertation upon the tenth chapter of the fifth book of Mr. Locke's Essay, &c., by William Carroll, 1706. "I have been told that the said 'Rights of the Christian Church' has been writ by a gentleman, or a set of gentlemen, misled by the principles established in the Essay of Human Understanding. I took a cursory view of the Rights and found it to be another offspring of the said Essay."—p. 277. In the Preliminary Discourse to Spinoza revived, Hickes speaks of "those books and letters, for which, to his everlasting dishonour, the deists as it were canonize his memory," and says, "one of the deists or atheists told one of my friends that it was some time in Mr. Locke's hands before he died." This is not unlikely if we consider Collins' intimacy with Locke, see note y, p. 82, and Locke's letters to Collins; published in "a collection of several pieces of Mr. Locke," by Des Maiseaux, 1736. Locke died Oct. 28, 1704. The letters are contained in the last volume of the 8vo. editions of his collected works.]

for those who will not read them at all, or, as they should, with patience and impartiality, I may say, in allusion to the Apostle, if our Church, and its Gospel, and evangelical constitution, and priesthood are hid, they are only "hid to those who are lost;" to those who have ears, and will not hear, eyes and will not see, and whose hearts are hardened in scepticism or perfect unbelief. CONCLUDING REMARKS. 2 Cor. 4.

It hath been a great satisfaction and comfort to me, and so will be in my last moments, that these unbelievers have so persecuted me, in particular among other more worthy clergymen since the first edition of this work[q]. I look upon all their lies and libels upon me as so many marks of honour, and I hope I may presume to say, without arrogance or vanity, that their malice against me in their pamphlets proceeds from the sense they have of the harm I have done them in this prefatory answer, and other discourses lately published against them[r]; and I praise Almighty God, who hath counted me worthy to be hated by them, and those wicked spirits whose instruments they are, and by whom, upon Christian principles, I doubt not but they are inspired.

In what I have written of the communion office, I have spoken in behalf of the ancient order of using the prayer of oblation in or immediately upon the prayer of consecration[s], and to prevent any mistakes, or any just objection, which may be made against me upon that account, I beg leave to present the reader with the words of one of the greatest divines and prelates that this Church, or perhaps any other, ever had; who, in spite of calumny, will always be glorious in his martyrdom and memory; I mean Archbishop Laud, in his reply to the charge of the Scottish commissioners[t]: "To invert the order of some prayers in the communion, or any other part of the service, doth neither pervert the prayers, nor corrupt the worship of God..... And though I shall not find fault with the order of the prayers, as they

[q] [e. g. "A new Catechism with Dr. Hickes' Thirty-nine Articles," a pamphlet which went through at least three editions in 1710. It is printed in Somers' Collection of Tracts; vol. xii. p. 176. ed. 2. 1814.]

[r] [See above, note p, p. 72.]

[s] [See above, p. 127.]

[t] History of the Troubles and Trial of Archbishop Laud, p. 115. [The charge was the transposing the prayers in the communion service of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, by putting the first prayer in the post communion of the English book immediately after the consecration and before the communion; see the words of the charge, p. 133, and the notes, p. 127.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXIII.

stand in the communion-book of England, (for, God be thanked, it is well,) yet if a comparison must be made, I do think the order of the prayers, as they now stand in the Scottish liturgy, to be the better and more agreeable to the use in the primitive Church; and I believe they who are learned will acknowledge it." And whenever the liturgy comes to be revised in convocation, I cannot but also wish that the prayer of oblation may be restored to its ancient place, as in the offices in the appendix[u]. And since I have taken some pains in the following Letters to shew that Christian presbyters are proper priests appointed by God to bless the people, I cannot also forbear wishing, not only that the apostolical benediction at the end of the morning and evening services were put in the apostolic form, to be pronounced standing by the priest, but also that some other prayers might, by addition or alteration, be appointed, which the priest alone should put up for the people, as in the ancient liturgies of the Church.

[2 Cor. 13. 24.]

And whereas I have written for the strict observation of the restored rubric[x], which enjoins the priest to place the bread and wine upon the holy table immediately after the alms of the people are humbly presented and set upon it, and for the more convenient practice of that rubric have after the ancient manner recommended the use of a Prothesis[y], or another table from whence he may fetch them, or they may be brought to him: I desire a liberty here to observe, that in churches where there are vestries, the tables therein are very proper for that purpose, and that in churches where there are none, such tables may be set up in any side aisle on either side of the chancel; and where there are no such side aisles, there cannot want other convenient places, wherein to set such necessary boards; necessary, I say, for the observation of that rubric, the general neglect whereof I cannot but bemoan; nor can I imagine with what conscience those of the clergy who know it can neglect it more than any other rubric, or how any of them can ridicule the observation of it, as I am assured one dignified priest did; or presume, as an-

[u] [The communion office in the first book of Edward VI., Appendix No. i., and the Scottish Prayer Book, ibid., No. ii.]

[x] [See above, pp. 127, 128.]

[y] [See note x, p. 129.]

other[z] with uncommon latitude hath had the confidence to do since the last edition of this book, not only to excuse the neglect of it as a 'punctilio,' but to assert that as such it is "vacated by the universal practice of the Church, even of the bishops themselves." It was high time for Mr. Sharp[a] to tax the irregularities of such libertines among the clergy, who think themselves free to practise or not practise the orders of the Church by halves, or by wholes, as they please. But at this rate a Church of such priests, or where there is a majority of such priests as the doctor, and that bishop who supervised his book, may by their evil practice "vacate" not only what rubrics, but what canons they please, the thirty-sixth[b] not excepted, by subscription to which all clergymen admitted to cures oblige themselves to observe that form in ministering prayers and Sacraments which the liturgy prescribes; and if any of them who have so subscribed, and presume to prevaricate after subscription in omitting to observe the form, rites, and ceremonies enjoined to be observed in the Book of Common Prayer, he is first to be suspended by the thirty-eighth canon[c]; and if he doth not mend his practice within a month after, he is to be deprived. But seeing these loose and treacherous sort of priests, who have caused so much mischief to the Church, notwithstanding the

[z] Dr. Hancock in his Answer to some things contained in Dr. Hickes's Christian Priesthood, pp. 139, 140. [See above, p. 2, note g. "These gentlemen can find fault with our deviating from a punctilio in the rubric, though in effect vacated by the universal practice of the Church, and even of the bishops themselves," &c.]

[a] [The Rev. J. Sharp, curate of Stepney, in "An Appeal of the Clergy of the Church of England to my lords the Bishops, humbly beseeching them to move her most Sacred Majesty to redress their grievances." Part ii. London, 1705. p. 5, he says, "I am convinced that if the canons of the Church were all and every one of them put in due execution we should have another scene of affairs;" and p. 7, he appeals to the rubrics.]

[b] [Canon xxxvi. "Subscription required of such as are to be made ministers. No person shall hereafter be received into the ministry, nor either by institution or collation admitted to any ecclesiastical living, nor suffered to preach, to catechise, &c., except he shall first subscribe to these three articles following . . . II. That the Book of Common Prayer, and of ordering of bishops, priests, and deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God, and that it may lawfully so be used; and that he himself will use the form in the said book prescribed, in public prayer, and administration of the Sacraments, and none other."]

[c] [Canon xxxviii. "Revolters after subscription censured. If any minister, after he hath once subscribed to the said three articles, shall omit to use the form of prayer, or any of the orders or ceremonies prescribed in the communion book, let him be suspended; and if after a month he do not reform and submit himself, let him be excommunicated, and then if he shall not submit himself within the space of another month, let him be deposed from the ministry."]

authority and obligation of her canons to the contrary, assume to themselves a liberty of dispensing with, and making her injunctions void; I must put them in remembrance, however they are dignified or distinguished, of the Act of Uniformity of Public Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments[d] &c., that if they do not think themselves obliged for conscience sake strictly to obey the Church in observing her orders, they may know they are bound to do it for wrath by the said act. And to convince Dr. Hancock, and such priests as he, be they of the higher or lower order, that it is not in their power to "vacate" the rubrics of the Church, or vary from the order, manner, or form in which she hath appointed the Sacraments to be administered, I must ask his leave to tell him a short but true story for his edification. Such another parish priest as he, in ministering the holy communion, had for several years neglected to observe the rubric for the offertory, and receiving the alms of the people, as that rubric appoints, to the just offence of some of his flock; one of which, a worthy person, and a man of note in his parish, first desired, and then privately admonished him, to observe that rubric; but he persisting in the irregular neglect thereof, the good man went where there was authority ecclesiastical to complain of him; but there (*O tempora!*) he was told to the same purpose as the Doctor writes, that it was a thing of little moment, for which he gave himself so much trouble, a "punctilio" of a rubric, and that they would not have him make himself uneasy for such small matters, it being of no great importance whether the people gave their alms before or after the Sacrament was administered. But he, as a truly affectionate son of the Church, being as sensible of his own, as of his minister's duty, and not finding redress where it was to be expected, bethought himself of the Act of Uniformity, and thereupon went to his minister, and shewed him the act, and told him plainly if he once more omitted the offertory, he would bring an information against him upon that act in the crown office. After this kind and seasonable warning, the priest thought it convenient to observe the long-neglected rubric, and continued to observe it ever since without deviation; and if any of Dr. Hancock's churchwardens or

[d] xiv. Caroli II.

parishioners would please to proceed in like prudent and charitable manner with him for omitting the next rubric, which enjoins him after the offertory to set the bread and wine upon the Lord's table, he would then begin to think it was more than a "punctilio," and not in his power, and the power of the irregular clergy, though never so many or great, to "vacate" the observation of it by their sinful and scandalous neglect, as he with a peculiar confidence, and sort of casuistry not common among his brethren, presumes, upon what principle I know not, to affirm.

I designed also, in pursuance and consequence of what I have written about the Christian priesthood, to address myself in most humble manner to the clergy, to put them in remembrance of their office, as priests, and to study to adorn it, as much at least as they generally do their office, as preachers; and to that end, among other theories belonging to our profession, to study rightly to understand the powers and privileges of the priesthood, and what they are to practise as such, and not to neglect their sacerdotal talents, or lay them up, as it were, in a napkin, and suffer them to go farther into desuetude, to the dishonour of their Lord and Master, the great prejudice of the priestly part of their ministry, and the farther decay of that reverence which the ancient Christians shewed to their ministers as priests. We should study to be skilful confessaries and physicians of souls, as well as good preachers, to know when and how to use the power of remitting and retaining sins, of blessing the people, and of administering the Christian Sacrifice aright. These things God expects indispensably from us, as well as preaching; and of which let me say to those who, as it were, devote themselves to the one and neglect the other, "these things ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." That, of the two, requires our care at least as much as this, though it is now so much disused, chiefly I fear by the want of penitential canons, which every bishop of any country may supply in his own diocese, until the whole college can make penitential canons for the dioceses of the national Church. I also thought to have made a parænesis to the candidates of the priesthood, and the younger clergy, not to begin their studies in divinity at the wrong end, especially with Dutch systems,

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXIII.

such as Episcopius, Limborch[e], or any of our transcribers from them, but to study the apostolical learning in a diligent perusal of the Greek Testament, which ought to be carefully read two or three times over, and then to proceed to the diligent reading of the apostolic fathers, and after reading them to read all the fathers and provincial councils to the first general council of Nice, and the ecclesiastical histories of Eusebius, Socrates, and Sozomen. Did students of divinity take this method in their studies, the Church would not suffer by so many latitudinarians among her divines, nor should we have so many strange and dangerous assertions preached and printed, as, were it not to reflect, I could shew in great plenty have been published by divines of great parts, and otherwise learned, I mean in learning external to their profession, but not in the ancient ecclesiastical learning, which should be first studied by all clergymen, that being well versed in their own originals, they may not take such liberties of thinking and writing, or become such indifferents as some are, and run into many mistakes. But then if fatal want of books in the learned languages, or any other hard circumstances, will not allow students in divinity to peruse those early and ancient originals, then the next best thing they can do will be to read such orthodox divines of our own Church as fetched their divinity from those fountains: I mean such as Jewell, Poinet, Mede, Downam, Laud, Montague, Hammond, Pearson, Thorndike, Bull, Beveridge[f], &c., whose writings will instruct and fix them in true principles, and preserve them from that latitude, otherwise called largeness of mind, which hath corrupted divinity to such a deplorable degree, and set men free from

[e] [Bishop Burnet in his Pastoral Care had recommended Limborch; his words are, "a system of divinity must be read with exactness: they are almost all alike." After mentioning some shorter ones, he proceeds, "but to lead a man further I would advise him that studies divinity to read two larger bodies, writ by some eminent men of both sides, and because the latest are commonly the best, Turretin for the whole Calvinist hypothesis, and Limborch for the Arminian, will make a man fully the master of all the notions of both sides." Simon Episcopius was professor at Leyden and Amsterdam. His "Institutiones Theologicæ, in quatuor libros distinctæ," was much read by the early latitudinarians. See note m, p. 65, and p. 234. Philip Limborch was minister, and in 1668 professor of divinity, at Amsterdam. The work referred to is his "Theologia Christiana ad praxim pietatis ac promotionem Christianæ unice directa." Amsterdam, 1686.]

[f] [In the first edition the names given were "Hammond, Pearson, and Sanderson;" in the second, "Laud, Montague, Hammond, Pearson, Sanderson, Thorndike."]

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

the chief doctrines and principles of Christianity, which relate to the Church, as a society or as a sect.

Before I conclude, to acquit myself from the seeming imputation of tautology in my Discourse of the Christian Priesthood, I must advertise my reader that I have been forced to produce some testimonies and authorities out of the fathers several times, just as the same witnesses are usually examined again and again in judicial trials, not to the same, but several different points. Thus he will find the same testimony cited in one place barely to prove the Christian sacrifice, and, it may be, in another to shew that the oblation of the elements was such a special part of the Eucharistical worship; that προσφορα and *oblatio* were singly used to signify the holy communion, and προσφέρειν and *offerre* to celebrate the same; and perhaps in a third to shew in what sense the fathers understood such or such a text. So he may find the same authorities produced in one place to prove the oblation of the sacramental bread and cup to God the Father, and in another to prove the ἐπίκλησιν, or prayer unto Him to send down His Holy Spirit upon the oblations, and perhaps in a third to shew that tradition of the ancients, who taught that Christ Himself, in the institution of that holy Sacrament, offered the bread and wine to His Father, and thereby taught His disciples to do the same. I must also intreat the learned reader not to omit the testimonies I have in this answer to the Rights, or in the following Discourses, cited in the margin, which generally are as considerable as any in the text, and had been put there, could it have been conveniently done without wearying the greater part of readers, and clogging it too much.

I must also ask my readers' leave to take notice of a reflection, in which I have reason to think I am particularly pointed at for my way of writing this answer to the Rights. The words of the reflection are these which follow, divided into several paragraphs with as many replies. "I do not make it my business to cry out of the times[g]." Nor have I made it mine in this answer or elsewhere: to note the crying sins of the times is not to cry out of them, especially to note them

[g] Bishop Trimnell's Address to his Clergy before his Charge delivered to them at the Visitation of his Diocese in the year 1709, p. 4.

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXIII.

[1 Tim. 5. 24.]

with all the seriousness that becomes a Christian, and soberness and gravity that becomes a Christian priest. What the Apostle saith of men is justly applicable to times. The sins of some times are so open as well as great, and so notorious and glaring, as well as grievous, as precedently to any proof to bring them under the just censure and animadversion of every good Christian; and to every good Christian and Christian priest, even to as many of his own clergy as desired his lordship to print his charge, I dare appeal against him, whether in this answer to the Rights I have taken notice of these licentious times in any other manner than they deserve, or what becomes my character as a priest, or what deserves the name of exclamation in the sense his lordship means by crying out. "His lordship confesses[h], that the design of the writer of the Rights was apparently wicked, levelled against all the Christian religion, and not at all framed to promote any thing that was honest and good." In another place[i], "that his book destroys even the name and notion of the Church, and deserves to be mentioned with the utmost abhorrence, and that this age hath produced several such;" and could it then deserve censure to tax liberties allowed in such an age to print such books, which no other Christian nation, reformed or unreformed, would allow? "Which (times) will sooner mend by a quiet doing our duty, than by inveighing against them[k]." Here the phrase is only varied, "inveighing" instead of "crying out;" and I would pray his lordship to consider, if St. Ignatius, Cyprian, Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Ambrose, or to name but one presbyter, Tertullian, were now living among us, whether their zeal for Christ and His Church, and to preserve their flocks from the wolves, would not have obliged them to cry out *O tempora!* and even inveigh against the Gallionism of the age: nay in all humility I pray his lordship seriously to consider, whether the Apostles, had any of them lived in our nation and times, would not have cried out against the spiritual governors in particular, and in a very severe manner, for not censuring these devoted enemies of Christ and His Church; or which is next to nothing, for censuring of them only as Eli did his sons, those sons of Belial, which though

[h] Charge, p. 4. [i] Ibid., p. 3. [k] [Ibid., p. 4.]

he might call it a quiet doing of his duty, yet God accounted it no better than not doing it at all. And I would also beseech his lordship to consider what the Spirit said unto the Churches of Pergamus and Thyatira, and by them to the Church of England, for suffering antichristian men who fill the world with worse doctrines than those of Balaam or the Nicolaitans, and to seduce her sons and daughters from believing any revealed religion to scepticism or utter unbelief. "When men are so affected at the iniquities they at any time see, as to take the most proper course to have them removed, they give proof of their being religious and wise, and can hardly fail of curing some at least of the evils they find[l]." Here I agree with his lordship. But then I must say, to take no course at all, or to take one that is no better than none, to remove any evils, is not to take the most proper course, nor of giving proofs of being religious or wise. And as to the evils his lordship means, I dare be bold to say, had Grindal, or Whitgift, or Bancroft, or Laud been now living, they would not have taken the course which I suppose his lordship thinks most proper, but some other to silence those enemies of all revealed religion: they would have exercised their own spiritual authority against them, by the highest censures in and out of convocation; and with prayers, and had it been needful, with tears also, supplicated the secular powers for God's and His Christ's sake, and every thing that was sacred in the Christian religion, to curb their insolence, and put some stop to their blasphemies, by doing of which, with or without success, they had, I conceive, taken the most proper course, at least to deliver their own souls. "But when such things, which are more or less the infelicity of all times, are aggravated to blacken the present, and when that is done, to reproach those who govern no better, there is as little justice as there is piety or wisdom in such kind of complaints, and they are not like to mend the condition of things[m]." This way of apology will serve to excuse any man, as well as any times: but when such things (may the worst of men say) which more or less are the infirmities of all men, are aggravated to blacken us, and when that is done to re-

CONCLUDING REMARKS. [Rev. 2. 12, 18, sqq.]

[l] [Charge, p. 4.]

[m] [Ibid.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXIII.

proach us for living no better, there is as little justice as there is piety or wisdom in such kind of complaints, and they are not like to mend us. Thus hath his lordship made an apology for the worst of men or people, as well as for the worst of times, which can be supposed to happen; and according to this way of apologizing for times, there can be none so bad wherein the ministers of Christ, those watchmen of Israel, ought to lift up their voices like trumpets, or complain and cry out against the sins of any times, be they never so great. This apology would have served for the times of the Great Rebellion, and even to have extenuated the iniquities of those times of which both a Prophet and an Apostle said, "there is none righteous, no not one. There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable, there is none that doeth good, no not one." I might challenge his lordship to shew, that in my complaints of the times I have used any such hyperboles, or other figures of aggravation; though if I had, I could justify myself by authorities both human and Divine. Might it justly be said of Livy, for his complaint in the margin[n], that he blackened the times in which he lived, and reproached those who governed no better? Or will his lordship say, that Salvian[o] blackened the times he lived in, when he described the grievous sins of them, one of which was not to punish, but tolerate piacular crimes? To blacken, by a metaphor in our language, signifies to defame men or times unjustly,

[Ps. 14. 1, sqq.]

[Rom. 3. 10, sqq.]

[n] Labente deinde paulatim disciplina, velut desidentes primo mores sequatur animo; deinde ut magis magisque lapsi sunt, tum ire cœperint præcipites, donec ad hæc tempora, quibus nec vitia nostra, nec remedia pati possumus, perventum est.—[Tit. Livii Hist., lib. i. præfat.]

[o] [Salvian was a priest of the Church of Marseilles. He wrote about the middle of the fifth century. The work referred to is his treatise, "De Gubernatione Dei, et de justo Dei præsentique judicio;" composed when the Goths were invading the west; and shewing that the sins of Christians were the cause of the judgments which fell on them. The following probably is the passage which Hickes had in his mind; in which, after dwelling on the crimes committed by Christians, Salvian says: Quis vexatis aut laborantibus opem tribuat, cum improborum hominum violentiæ etiam sacerdotes Domini non resistant? Nam aut tacent plurimi eorum; aut similes sunt tacentibus, etiamsi loquantur; et hoc multi non inconstantia, sed consilio, ut putant, atque ratione; exertam enim veritatem proferre nolunt, quia eam aures hominum improborum sustinere non possunt; ..... et ideo tacent etiam qui loqui possunt, dum ipsis interdum malis parcunt.—Salviani Massiliensis, de Gubernatione Dei, lib. v. cap. v. p. 104. Baluz. Paris. 1684. and Biblioth. Patr., tom. x. p. 29, C, D, sqq.]

without cause, or spitefully to aggravate common failings or faults of a lower degree into great sins. This his lordship suggests as if I had done it, though in effect I have said no more of the times than his lordship hath done in his charge, where he acknowledges[p] "the liberty with which too many treat the Christian religion in way of contempt, would incline one to believe there was less of the sense of it upon men's minds than hath formerly been." Here his lordship complains of the liberty which too many take; and I only bewailed the liberty which those too many are allowed to take, and, as I thought my Christian and priestly duty obliged me, set it forth upon Scripture principles, as a crying sin. But then his lordship, to qualify what he had said of the times, immediately subjoins, that "if we consider the many present works of piety, particularly those for the education of children, we cannot but hope that there is a spirit of true Christianity moving among us, and such an one as will be too strong for all the despicable attempts of profane and atheistical men[q]." His lordship must give me leave to observe, that excepting some very few times and places, such as the old world and Sodom, there were scarce any so wicked, in which a true spirit of religion did not move among a considerable number of good men. Several thousands such there were in the little kingdom of Israel in the time of Ahab, and even when they were carried into captivity; but neither their prayers nor their tears could prevail with God not to judge the nation for the provoking sins of it. And his lordship knows who said, and of what times he said it, that "except the Lord of Hosts had left unto us a small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, and like unto Gomorrah." I mightily differ from his lordship in thinking the attempts of atheists and deists despicable, for I think I could shew that they are not to be despised. They are confederate at home, and have allies abroad. "They have slain their thousands and ten thousands;" but I must not insist upon this unhappy and nice subject, lest I should seem to "blacken the times, and reproach those who govern no better," and be told for so doing that I was "neither religious nor wise, nor like to mend the condition of things." I was

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

[1 Kings 19. 18.]

[Isa. 1. 9.]

[p] Charge, p. 2. [See note a, p. 1.]

[q] [Ibid.]

PREFAT. DISCOURSE, SECT. XXIII.

going to put his lordship in remembrance of Priestcraft in Perfection[r], to which I heard he had some thoughts of making an answer, and to ask him, if upon reading of it he did not cry out, *O tempora!* But I must remember how I am confined, and therefore conclude with the words of Hugo Floriacensis[s], in the prologue to his book of the Sacerdotal Dignity: *Veruntamen precor eos per eorum magnificentiam, ne eis sordescat meum rusticum eloquium, sed malint veros, quam disertos audire sermones; cæterum scio quia tutius veritas auditur, quam prædicatur. Unde nunc deprecor omnes venerabiles præsules, et reliquos sanctæ ecclesiæ prælatos et clericos simul sensatos, qui hæc lecturi sunt, ne me præsumptorem judicent aut temerarium, quasi ego eos in cathedris sedentes et divinæ philosophiæ arcana scientes superbe coner instruere. Non quæso ita existiment, sed hæc pie et æquanimiter legant atque suscipiant. Opto enim et ut ipsi omnes venerabiles patres et domini mei cotidie proficiant in Christo Jesu Domino nostro, et ut ecclesiæ sanctæ corpus eorum temporibus ordine congruo corroboretur, et firmo pacis fœdere jugiter perfruatur.* Amen.

[r] [See note x, pp. 79, 80.]

[s] Baluzii Miscellan., lib. iv. p. 11. [Paris, 1678, sqq. tom. ii. p. 184. Mansi, Lucca, 1761. The title is, Hugo de Sancta Maria, monachus S. Bened. Floriac. de Regia potestate et Sacerdotali dignitate; it was dedicated to Hen. I. of England. The writer's monastery was at Fleury, or S. Benoit sur Loire.]

SOLI DEO GLORIA.

OXFORD:
PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

P. 8, marginal heading; for *Ignatius* read *Irenæus.*

P. 107, note k; *add,* The date of the interleaved Prayer-Book is 1619, not 1617. This and the other of 1638, marked as Cosin's by Nicholls, are thus entered in the catalogue of Bishop Cosin's library, drawn up by his secretary, under his own eye: "The Common Prayer-Book, in large paper, set forth A° 1638, with the book of consecration and ordination, wherein be inserted leaves of white paper through the whole book for my owne notes and observations upon it, both doctrinal and historical. Lond. 1638.

The same book again, with paper and notes so inserted, set forth A° 1619."

P. 142, note b; *for* 43, *read* cxviii., *and omit* Oxon . . . Benedictines.

P. 238, note a; *omit* of this . . . say; *put* (vita Tertull. A.D. 213.) *after* existimet; *and for* They place this statement, *read* This statement is placed.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.
This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

ICLF (N)

AUG 5 1967 92

RECEIVED
SEP 12 '67 -8 AM

APR 31 1980

REC. CIR. APR 30 1980

LD 21A-60m-2,'67
(H241s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

Berkeley
THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA · LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA